

Tribune of March 20, captioned "The Cure That Failed," for a few moments caused me to think quite well of myself. The first three sentences are as follows:

The Committee for Economic Development, a businessmen's organization, issued a report Monday declaring it to be essential that the Government adopt deficit financing whenever a serious recession in business develops. The committee says that to get out of a bad slump the Treasury should try not to raise enough revenue to pay for what it spends. Rather, it should reduce the income as the outgo mounts.

The Chicago Committee for Economic Development was of the opinion that, to balance the national budget, instead of soaking the people with additional taxes—for the Government has no other income—we should cut Federal appropriations.

Reading that paragraph for the third time, it came to my mind that several times on the floor of the House, and many, many times in letters to the home folks when they complained about high taxes—though some in the same letter asked for additional appropriations for one thing or another—I, and I capitalize the "I," had suggested that the true rem-

edy was a reduction in governmental expenses.

Many times it has been my privilege to call attention to specific items, not only of extravagance, but of obvious waste, not only in the executive departments, but in the housekeeping of the Congress itself.

The all-too-often answer that came to me from some of my colleagues, and from some executive agencies, when it was suggested that this, that, or the other item of expenditure be avoided, was a frown or scowl, an expression of pain or disgust, a few left-handed compliments, downright plain rebuke or a suggestion that in some way I might practice a little more economy myself. The latter I have always tried to do, even though some of those who were personally adversely affected by the economy move did not appear overly happy.

When, as chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, I suggested that, when Congress was not in session, the committee members should curtail some of their traveling, not only in this country, but abroad, the committee members—shall I say, "retaliated";

perhaps I should say, "responded"—by cutting off my authority as committee chairman to appoint special three-man subcommittees, and arrogated to themselves as members of subcommittees the authority to go when, where, and for any purpose they deemed advisable, to make investigations and hold hearings. Two of them have now spent 66 days abroad at taxpayers' expense.

Individuals and groups, inside and outside Government, think there should be economy—retrenchment—but usually in fields other than their own.

I still think that the way toward balancing the budget, toward reducing taxes, and sometime, I hope, making a payment on the national debt, is to cut down the expenditures of both the executive and the legislative departments. Just talking about it, promising it as each election approaches, so far hasn't done very much good.

This being an election year, if the people will get hot enough under the collar—if I may use that expression—to get after their Congressmen on this issue, there is still time before adjournment to get some worthwhile reductions in Federal expenditures.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, who art the fountain of all grace, who knowest our necessities before we ask, our ignorance in asking, and our fallible judgments: Have compassion, we beseech Thee, upon our infirmities. Strengthen us in all noble impulses, and daily increase in us the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the passion to find the truth and to be utterly fair in all our dealings and decisions. Dowered with privileges as no other Nation, give us a sympathy with other peoples whose prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," has never yet been answered. May our high pedestal of well-being prove to be Thy call to protect the weak and exploited, that through the potent ministry of our dear land all peoples of the earth may be blessed. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 25, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his

secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On March 26, 1954:

S. 489. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land, located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut;

S. 1827. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to disclaim any interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the State of Washington;

S. 2111. An act to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day in Flag House Square, Baltimore, Md.;

S. 2348. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of redcedar shingles"; and

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium.

On March 27, 1954:

S. 79. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of

the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REED of New York; Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MILLS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission to be absent from the Senate from 2 o'clock today until Wednesday afternoon, in order that I may return to Kansas to attend a funeral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### CHANGE OF CONFEREES ON EXCISE TAX BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because of the illness of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] be substituted as one of the Senate conferees on the excise tax bill. After consultation with the minority, I understand the substitution is agreeable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS, ETC. (S. Doc. No. 110)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, in the amount of \$1,553,745, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### INCREASED RETIREMENT ANNUITIES OF CIVILIAN MEMBERS OF TEACHING STAFFS OF THE MILITARY ACADEMIES AND NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL HERETOFORE RETIRED

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School heretofore retired (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### NOTICE OF PUBLICATION OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF WHOLE BLACK PEPPER

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 161,617 pounds of whole black pepper now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### REPORT ON TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LANDS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, of the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORT ON COST AND FEASIBILITY OF SOUTHWEST CONTRA COSTA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT SYSTEM, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the feasibility and estimated cost of the Southwest Contra Costa County water district system, California (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of sundry aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of certain aliens from reports heretofore transmitted to the Senate, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Resolution 44

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the legislation presently before it providing for the transportation of the U. S. S. *Constellation* from Boston to Baltimore, its home port

"Whereas the U. S. S. *Constellation*, oldest of the Nation's battleships, is presently berthed at the Boston Navy Yard; and

"Whereas this venerable vessel was launched at Baltimore on September 8, 1797; and

"Whereas more than 150 years ago a crew of Marylanders aboard the U. S. S. *Constellation* won the first American naval victory; and

"Whereas there is at present a bill before the Congress of the United States ordering the destruction of this famous ship; and

"Whereas it is the earnest desire of the people of Maryland to have the U. S. S. *Constellation* moved back to Baltimore, its home port, and preserved at Fort McHenry as a national shrine: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully urged to enact the legislation presently before it with respect to the U. S. S. *Constellation* so that this ship may be returned to the State of Maryland as promptly as possible; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Members of the Maryland delegation to the Congress of the United States, and to the Maryland Historical Society.

"By the house of delegates, March 1, 1954.

"Rules suspended and adopted.

"JOHN C. LUBER,

"Speaker of the House of Delegates.

"CLEMENT R. MERCALDO,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Resolution 13

"Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds to aid in school construction and in current school expenses in local school districts abnormally affected by increases in enrollment due to federally connected children.

"A significant part of the increasing burden of schools in Maryland counties and

the city of Baltimore is coming from the influx of Federally connected children for whom schools must be provided. The Federal Government has recognized a responsibility for helping these Maryland counties and other counties and cities elsewhere in the country which are similarly affected. The Congress at the last session enacted two laws for the relief of such school districts. Public Law 246 extended Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress so that schools may apply for assistance in the construction of facilities needed to house federally connected children, who entered school between June 1952 and June 1954 and for whom no school facilities are available. The Office of Education estimates that the aid authorized by this new legislation will total \$174 million for the 2-year period 1952-54. The Congress at the end of last session appropriated only \$70 million for the first year's construction.

"It is apparent that \$104 million is needed in supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1954 and a new appropriation for fiscal year 1955 if the authorized program is to be carried out.

"Public Law 246 authorizes aid only for federally connected children who entered school between June 1952 and June 1954. There will be many such children who will enter Maryland schools in later years for whom there will not be adequate school facilities. It is therefore desirable that the authorizing legislation be extended for later years.

"The Congress at the last session also enacted Public Law 248 which extended Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress and extended the program of Federal financial assistance to school districts affected by Federal activity for current expenses through the fiscal year 1956. The Congress appropriated \$66,500,000 for payments under Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1954. This will permit the payment of only a part of the aid authorized. A supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1954 would be desirable and a regular appropriation for fiscal year 1955 will be necessary to provide Maryland and other counties the assistance authorized by law: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That the Congress of the United States be requested to take the necessary action to obtain the appropriation of sufficient funds to carry out the full intent of Public Law 246 and Public Law 248 for Federal aid to construction of facilities and for payment of current expenses in local school districts occasioned by increases in enrollment due to federally connected children. And be it further

*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"By the House of Delegates, February 11, 1954.

"JOHN C. LUBER,

"Speaker of the House of Delegates.

"CLEMENT R. IGERCALDO,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by the school children of Casey Arriba Rural School, Anasco, Puerto Rico, condemning the action of certain persons in trying to assassinate Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Frank Andrews, Modesto, Calif., enclosing a petition now in circulation in the city of Modesto, Calif., and the Modesto irrigation district, relating to the storage of water from the Cherry project, Yosemite National Park and Forest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.



A letter in the nature of a petition from the Whittier (Calif.) Bar Association, signed by Josephine K. Stankey, secretary, favoring the enactment of legislation to increase judicial salaries; ordered to lie on the table.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL OPERATIONS OFFICE BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT TO SERVE THE NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Gust Anderson, secretary of the Central Labor Council of Portland and Vicinity, in the State of Oregon, endorsing the establishment of a regional operations office to serve Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and Alaska, which is now being considered by the Post Office Department. I present the letter for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL,  
Portland, Oreg., March 17, 1954.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Central Labor Council of Portland, Oreg., AFL, has endorsed the establishment of a regional operations office to serve Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and Alaska, which is now being considered by the Post Office Department. The principal function of this office will be to take care of financial operations, probably including payrolls, for the entire region.

Establishment of this office in Portland would require the employment of about 30 more postal employees here, and several more bank tellers. Bank deposits would be between \$800,000 and \$1 million daily.

If the office is established in Seattle or some other city, the loss to Portland would be \$200,000 daily in deposits, and a loss of about 15 postal personnel. While this is not a great number, it is still another drop in our already brimming bucket of unemployment.

Office space soon will be available, since the entire fourth floor of the main post office is being vacated by the Forest Service.

Communications between Portland and the area to be served are excellent because of Portland's central location.

For a long time Portland has been the stepchild of the Pacific coast so far as regional functions of the Federal Government are concerned; nearly all of these operations are located in either Seattle or San Francisco.

Here is a chance for a good change. We feel that the Oregon delegation in Congress and President Eisenhower should be notified that this council believes that if a regional operations office of the Post Office Department is established, it should be located in Portland, Oreg.

Respectfully,

GUST ANDERSON,  
Secretary.

#### DALLAS DISTRICT OFFICE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION OF TEXARKANA AMERICAN LEGION POSTS, NOS. 25-28, ARKANSAS-TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Veterans' Administration is going ahead with plans to consolidate its district office at Dallas,

Tex., with the district office at Denver, Colo.

In a resolution recently adopted by Texarkana American Legion Posts Nos. 25-28, Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., President Eisenhower was asked to intervene, in the interest of all veterans and their dependents, in the plan to consolidate the Dallas office with the Denver office.

This resolution is a proper part of the record concerning this proposal. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas VA Administrator H. V. Higley recently announced that the Dallas district office of the Veterans' Administration will be moved with the Denver Unit within 60 days; and

Whereas just 2 days prior to that announcement the Texarkana Gazette carried a front-page story released by the Associated Press stating that leaders in Washington had assured all interested parties that the proposed move would be delayed indefinitely until a thorough exploration of the matter could be made; and

Whereas Mr. Higley announced that the move was being made for economic reasons; and

Whereas in 1952 VA Administrator Carl Gray spent \$605,000 of Government money to have a study made by Booz, Allen & Hamilton, management consultant engineers, of all VA operations for economy and efficiency. They recommended consolidation of all insurance functions into 3 centers and further recommended that Dallas, Tex., be 1 of the 3 centers; and

Whereas these experts stated (vol. VI, pp. 53 and 54) "Dallas has a good geographic location in the South and about halfway between the east and west coast. Personnel is reported to be available in adequate numbers. Railroad and airline transportation is satisfactory, too. The Federal Government owns an office building and \* \* \*." They further stated: "Preference for Dallas is indicated because it is more centrally located in the territory to be served."; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs inspected all of the 5 district offices in August 1953, and their printed report shows that the Dallas office has the best record of any office in the country for time taken to handle claims and release awards, which indicates to us that experts in the field of veterans' affairs, as late as 1952 and 1953, recognized the advantage of having 1 of the 3 insurance centers located in Dallas, Tex.; and

Whereas even private insurance companies recognize the desirability of maintaining local offices across the country where policyholders can get service on their policies. And, if it is good business for them to do so, it seems very important to us that the United States Government should render service easily accessible to America's wartime defenders whom the Government have urged to maintain their Government insurance; and

Whereas to remove the insurance service many hundred miles further from all of the veterans in the South will result in loss of service to the veteran, which by far outweighs any projected paper saving. The only saving would be in monetary benefits which the veteran and his dependents will lose by being deprived of proper accessible service which never was the intent of a grateful Congress and the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Texarkana American Legion Posts Nos. 25-28, Texarkana, Ark.-Tex.,

in regular meeting Tuesday, March 16, 1954, That a telegram be sent to President Eisenhower voicing our objections to this proposed move and asking him to intervene, in the interest of all veterans and their dependents, in the present plans of Administrator Higley; and, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Eisenhower, Senators Lyndon B. Johnson and Price Daniels, asking that they continue their fight to maintain this district office in Dallas, Tex., one of the most efficient district offices of the Veterans' Administration.

The foregoing resolution was read and adopted in the regular membership meeting of Posts Nos. 25-58 of the Texarkana American Legion this 16th day of March 1954.

ARTHUR L. JENNINGS,  
Commander.

Attest:

ROY C. TURNER,  
Adjutant.

#### LETTER AND RESOLUTIONS OF ITALIAN ALLIANCE CLUBS OF NORTH AMERICA, INC.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the Italian Alliance Clubs of North America, Inc., signed by Frank Covello, chairman of the legislative committee, transmitting two resolutions adopted by that organization relating to the present quota system in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and the increased postage rate on gift packages going to European countries. I present the letter and resolutions for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were received, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred, as follows:

ITALIAN ALLIANCE CLUBS  
OF NORTH AMERICA, INC.,  
March 25, 1954.

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: There appears to be a strong feeling among Americans of Italian descent living in Connecticut that the quota provided for in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 fails to allocate to the countries of southern Europe and especially Italy an adequate quota of immigrants. It is the hope of Americans of Italian descent not only in Connecticut but throughout the country that something might be done to change the present act so as to make it possible for a greater number of Italian immigrants to enter this country.

There has also developed considerable feeling against the increase in the postal rates for gift packages sent to European countries and Italy in particular. The postal rates are now so high that it has become impracticable to send gift packages to needy persons and relatives in Italy.

At its meeting on November 1, 1953, the Italian Alliance Clubs of North America passed resolutions on each of these subjects. I have been asked to send to you copies of these resolutions. It is the hope of the Italian Alliance Clubs of North America that you will support any measure intended to give to Italy a larger quota of immigrants and will also support any measure intended to reduce the postal rates on gift packages sent to Europe.

Very truly yours,  
FRANK COVELLO,  
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

**"RESOLUTION 1**

"We, the officers, delegates, and members of the Italian Alliance Clubs of North America, Inc., comprising 42 affiliated societies and clubs, being assembled and gathered in convention at Torrington, Conn., on this date, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas under the present quota system in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (also known as the McCarran Act), immigrants may be admitted only at the rate of a basic 153,700, more or less, a year, and only under quotas allotted to different nationalities in the same proportion to said 153,700 that the number of persons of the given nationality resident in the country in 1920 bore to the total continental population; and

"Whereas said quota system makes the annual quota of any quota area one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of inhabitants in the continental United States in 1920 attributable by national origin to such quota area; and

"Whereas such quota system is purely discriminatory in nature, arbitrarily and capriciously directed against nationals and origins from the southern and eastern European countries, e. g., the Italian nationals and origins; being predicated on a formula to favor and insure that the great majority of immigrants will be solely of northwestern European stock; and

"Whereas said quota system should be immediately reviewed and its formula completely revised, taking into consideration present-day nationals and origins, without disfavor and discrimination directed toward the southern and eastern European countries: Be it

"Resolved, That the Italian Alliance Clubs of North America, Inc., go on record, insisting upon immediate action by the United States Congress when it convenes in January 1954, and to give support to legislation or to initiate legislation toward alleviating the said injustice existing in the present quota system in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952."

**"RESOLUTION COMMITTEE.**

"Passed by the convention assembled:

"CHARLES C. DRAGHI,  
Chairman."

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

**"RESOLUTION 4**

"We, the officers, delegates, and members of the Italian Alliance Clubs of North America, Inc., comprising 42 affiliated societies and clubs, being assembled and gathered in convention in Torrington, Conn., on this date, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the United States postal rates have been increased, once again, from 14 cents per pound on gift packages sent to European countries, in particular, Italy; and

"Whereas said postal rates are now as follows, to wit, 45 cents for the first pound and 22 cents per pound for each pound thereafter; and

"Whereas such postal rates create a financial burden and hardship; and

"Whereas such increased postal costs tend to discourage the flow of gift packages to European countries, and making such measure prohibitive in nature; and

"Whereas said gift packages contain needy goods to worthy and needy peoples: Be it

"Resolved, That the Italian Alliance Clubs of North America, Inc., go on record, protesting the said postal rate increase and the Postmaster General and the Congressmen be so informed."

**"RESOLUTION COMMITTEE.**

"Passed by the convention assembled:

"CHARLES C. DRAGHI,  
Chairman."

**DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS—STATEMENT AND RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have warned again and again against the chain reaction of damage which will flow from the slash of dairy-parity support from 90 percent to 75 percent the coming Thursday, April 1.

I have pointed out that in an avalanche of messages to me from the grassroots of my State, farmers have pointed out that they cannot possibly stand the ruinous reduction in their income—income which gives to them now a mere 6 cents per quart of milk.

I send to the desk additional grassroots messages. I believe they are accurately indicative of opinion throughout America's dairyland.

I earnestly hope that proposed legislation which I have cosponsored will be enacted to forestall this parity slash.

I ask unanimous consent that the messages be printed at this point in the RECORD, and referred to the Senate Agriculture Committee.

There being no objection, the statement and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**WISCONSIN COOPERATIVE**

**CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,**

Union Center, Wis., March 23, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The delegates of the Wisconsin Cooperative Creamery Association, representatives of over 4,000 producers, at a special meeting held at Union Center, Wis., March 22, 1954, unanimously adopted the following statement:

"We deplore the action of the Secretary of Agriculture in lowering the support level of manufactured dairy products from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent as being too drastic and unfair to one small segment of agriculture, and particularly to a portion of that industry.

"The prices received by the producer of milk for fluid use will be reduced, under the present program, only on that percentage of his milk which will be diverted into manufactured products.

"We urge the Congress to alleviate this burden by limiting the Secretary's discretionary powers to not more than a 5-percent drop of the parity price in any 1 year.

"We feel that any reduction in prices received by producers of manufactured milk should be met with a comparable reduction to the producer of milk for fluid use."

Sincerely,

PAUL ORME,  
General Manager.

**COLUMBUS FALL RIVER CO-OP OIL CO.,**

Columbus, Wis., March 24, 1954.

Senator WILEY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Whereas the price of what the dairy farmer buys is as high or higher than ever; and

Whereas the cost of labor and extra effort to produce a clean and desirable product; and

Whereas other products such as oils, nuts, publications are subsidized far more than dairy products: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Columbus Fall River Co-op Oil Co., at its annual meeting March 19, 1954, voted unanimously against 90 percent of parity being reduced in any way.

ARTHUR H. BIEDERMANN,  
Secretary.

FARMERS UNION CO-OP,  
Medford-Stetsonville, Wis., March 26, 1954.  
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The 800 members of our cooperative at their annual meeting, held March 20, unanimously adopted the following resolution which we are sending to you for your consideration:

"Whereas farmers' net income decreased 7 percent in 1953, at the same time total personal incomes of all United States citizens increased 28 percent from 1947 to 1953; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, by Government order, is attempting to further decrease the dairy farmer's income: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Stetsonville Farmers Union Cooperative members assembled at their annual meeting hereby protest the drastic cut in dairy farm price supports and urge that dairy prices be maintained equal to the basic commodity parity support level; be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be sent to Secretary Benson, Senators Wiley and McCarthy, and Congressmen O'Konski, Lester Johnson, and Melvin Laird."

We have the honor to remain,

Very truly yours,

B. H. DASSOW,  
Manager.

**RESOLUTION**

We, the producer owners of Mauston Cooperative Creamery, assembled in our annual meeting at Mauston, Wis., this 6th day of March 1954, do resolve as follows:

"We cannot agree with the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture in his too-dramatic cut in the support prices of manufactured dairy products. We urge the Congress to alleviate the burden on the manufacturing milk producer in order that it might be comparable to other segments of agriculture.

"Should the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture stand, whereby he has seen fit to reduce the parity prices of production and to increase consumption of these products, we resolve that in order to accomplish these purposes without placing an undue burden on one segment of the industry that the prices received by the fluid-milk producer and those received by the manufactured milk and butterfat producer be comparably reduced."

MAUSTON CO-OPERATIVE CREAMERY,  
ARTHUR F. ROBINSON, Secretary.

**REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE**

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 110. A bill for the relief of Christopher F. Jako (Rept. No. 1094);

S. 366. A bill for the relief of Sister Conception (Ida Riegel) (Rept. No. 1095);

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Kinoshita (Rept. No. 1096);

S. 661. A bill for the relief of Nino Sabino Di Michele (Rept. No. 1097);

S. 804. A bill for the relief of Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis (Rept. No. 1098);

S. 809. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Sperti (Rept. No. 1099);

S. 860. A bill for the relief of Juanita Andrada Lach and Leticia Andrada Lach (Rept. No. 1100);

S. 917. A bill for the relief of Stefan Burda, Anna Burda, and Nikolai Burda (Rept. No. 1101);

S. 1073. A bill for the relief of Mary Shizue Hirano (Rept. No. 1102);

S. 1135. A bill for the relief of Stamatis James Bratsanos (Rept. No. 1103);



S. 1141. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Noble (Rept. No. 1104);

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bentivegna (Rept. No. 1105);

S. 1290. A bill for the relief of Ruth Sonlin (Rept. No. 1108);

S. 1296. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Hall (Rept. No. 1107);

S. 1313. A bill for the relief of Olga Balabanov and Nicola Balabanov (Rept. No. 1108);

S. 1477. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Nicklaus (Rept. No. 1109);

S. 1600. A bill for the relief of Esther Saporita (Rept. No. 1110);

S. 2243. A bill for the relief of Seiko Nagai and her minor child (Rept. No. 1111);

S. 2307. A bill for the relief of Harold George Wetzlmair (Rept. No. 1112);

S. 2469. A bill for the relief of Francisco Vasquez-Dopazo (Frank Vasquez) (Rept. No. 1113);

S. 2499. A bill for the relief of Hua Lin and his wife, Lillian Ching-Wen Lin (nee Hu) (Rept. No. 1114);

H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub) (Rept. No. 1115);

H. R. 2441. A bill for the relief of Husnu Atallah Berker (Rept. No. 1116);

H. R. 3045. A bill for the relief of Nickolas K. Ioannides (Rept. No. 1117);

H. R. 3961. A bill for the relief of Margherita Di Meo (Rept. No. 1118);

H. R. 4707. A bill for the relief of Lee Yim Quon (Rept. No. 1119);

H. R. 4738. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich (Rept. No. 1120);

H. R. 4886. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Birgitta Maria Colwell (nee Friberg) (Rept. No. 1121);

H. R. 5085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tcherepnin (Rept. No. 1122); and

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week May 2 to May 8, 1954, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week (Rept. No. 1123).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 653. A bill for the relief of Meteorima Shizuko (Rept. No. 1124);

S. 939. A bill for the relief of Njdeh Hovhanissian Aslanian (Rept. No. 1125);

S. 1225. A bill for the relief of Brunhilde Walburga Golomb, Ralph Robert Golomb, and Patricia Ann Golomb (Rept. No. 1126);

S. 1321. A bill for the relief of Michajlo Dzieczko (Rept. No. 1127);

S. 1395. A bill for the relief of Manasseh Moses Manoukian, Elize Manoukian, nee Kardzair, and Socrat Manoukian, also known as Socrates Manoukian (Rept. No. 1128);

S. 2340. A bill for the relief of Alphonsus Devlin (Rept. No. 1129);

S. 2360. A bill for the relief of Jacob Vandenberg (Rept. No. 1130); and

S. 2596. A bill for the relief of Lucy Mao Mei-Yee Li (Rept. No. 1131).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 95. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Donka Kourteva Dikova (Dikoff) and her son Nicola Marin Dikoff (Rept. No. 1132);

S. 855. A bill for the relief of Kirill Mihailovich Alexeev, Antonina Ivenovna Alexeev, and minor children, Victoria and Vladimir Alexeev (Rept. No. 1133); and

S. 1126. A bill for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philip (Rept. No. 1134).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3192. A bill to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3193. A bill to protect the essential security interests of the United States by stimulating the domestic production of lead and zinc, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. (See the remarks of Mr. DWORSHAK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3194. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to suspend certificates of air carriers under certain additional conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3195. A bill for the relief of Milani Fernanda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3196. A bill for the relief of Dr. Helen Maria Roberts (Helen Maria Rebalaska); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 3197. A bill to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort;

S. 3198. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Helium Act (50 U. S. C. 161 (d)), and to repeal section 3 (13) of the act entitled "An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 708);

S. 3199. A bill to authorize additional use of Government motor vehicles at isolated Government installations, and for other purposes; and

S. 3200. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARTHY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3201. A bill for the relief of Zanis Rigos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. CASE):

S. 3202. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks when the above bill was introduced, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 3203. A bill to prohibit certain departments, agencies, bureaus, boards, commissions, and services of the Government from prescribing more than nominal fees or charges for inspections, certificates, registrations, licenses, permits, or applications issued or provided by them; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3204. A bill to continue temporarily existing 90-percent-of-parity price supports for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3205. A bill for the relief of Pamela Clowes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

the stockpiling program effective for those minerals. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3193) to protect the essential security interests of the United States by stimulating the domestic production of lead and zinc, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DWORSHAK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That no article (except babbitt metal, solder, lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glazier's lead, and lead wire) provided for in paragraph 391 or 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in any calendar year, beginning with the calendar year 1955, after the total aggregate quantity of lead contained in articles provided for in the said paragraphs 391 and 392 (not including the exceptions above specified) entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in such calendar year amounts to 335,000 short tons.

SEC. 2. No article (except zinc dust and zinc in sheets) provided for in paragraph 393 or 394 of said act, as amended, shall be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in any calendar year, beginning with the calendar year 1955, after the total aggregate quantity of zinc contained in articles provided for in the said paragraphs 393 and 394 (not including the exceptions above specified) entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in such calendar year amounts to 325,000 short tons.

SEC. 3. During the remainder of the calendar year 1954 beginning with the first calendar month following the 60th day after the enactment of this act, no article covered by section 1 or 2 of this act shall be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the aggregate quantity of lead contained in articles covered by the said section 1 or zinc contained in articles covered by the said section 2 amounts, respectively, to the quantity of lead or zinc specified in the said section 1 or 2 reduced by one-twelfth for each calendar month of the current calendar year which precedes the calendar month following the 60th day after the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. No article provided for in the said paragraphs 391, 392 (except babbitt metal, solder, lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glazier's lead, and lead wire), 393, or 394 (except zinc dust and zinc in sheets) shall be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the beginning of the 1st calendar month following the 60th day after the enactment of this act except by, or for the account of, a person or firm to whom a license has been issued by, or under the authority of, the Secretary of Commerce, and only in accordance with the terms of such license. Such licenses shall be issued under regulations of the Secretary of Commerce which he determines will result to the fullest extent practicable in (1) the equitable distribution of such articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption and (2) the allocation of shares of the quantities of the various articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption among foreign supplying countries, based upon the proportions supplied by such countries respectively during previous representative periods, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce, taking due account of any special factors which may have affected or may be affecting the trade in the articles concerned. No article of a kind which is subject to the import quota provisions of this act shall be imported for stockpiling under

#### STOCKPILING PROGRAM FOR CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC MINERALS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, on March 26 the President announced a stockpiling program for critical and strategic minerals. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to impose import quotas on lead and zinc in order to make

the authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, as amended.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out such provisions of this act which the Treasury Department is required to enforce.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference four administration bills relating to national defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills introduced by Mr. McCARTHY were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

S. 3197. A bill to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort;

S. 3198. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Helium Act (50 U. S. C. 161 (d)), and to repeal section 3 (13) of the act entitled "An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 708);

S. 3199. A bill to authorize additional use of Government motor vehicles at isolated Government installations; and for other purposes; and

S. 3200. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the first of the bills, S. 3197, to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort, was submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of the Treasury, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. It would reenact authority originally granted by the Congress in 1942 as part of the Second War Powers Act, but which was terminated with the repeal of that measure in 1946, and would enable the Government of the United States to accept gifts of money or other property, real or personal, conditioned upon their use for a designated purpose.

It is virtually identical with a bill, S. 1230, unanimously approved by the Committee on Government Operations in the 82d Congress, and which passed the Senate on the consent calendar.

The second of the bills, S. 3198, submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, would restore to the Secretary authority to dispose of helium byproducts. This authority was formerly vested in the Secretary of the Interior, but was included in a repealer bill prepared by the General Services Administration with a view to eliminating laws in conflict with provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, approved on recommendation of this committee, on October 21, 1951.

The bill has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the General Services Administration, including certain perfecting amendments to an original proposal previously submitted to the Committee on Government Operations.

The Comptroller General has held that this proposed legislation is required in order that the Secretary of the Interior may effectively carry out his responsibility under the Helium Act of 1925. It would reserve to the General Services Administration authority to dispose of property which is excess to the needs of the Department of the Interior. Under the provisions of the original statute, which would be restored by the proposed bill, the income received from the disposal of surplus helium byproducts was placed in a special revolving fund available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior for the development of new sources of helium supply, and for other purposes authorized by law.

The third bill, S. 3199, which would authorize additional use of Government motor vehicles at isolated Government installations, was submitted to the President of the Senate by the Department of Commerce, with a request for introduction and approval, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. It would authorize Government employees who are stationed in remote areas and have at their disposal Government-owned motor vehicles, to use such vehicles for transporting their children to school, to the hospital, or to a doctor's office, when and where no other means of transportation is available.

This bill provides further that the use of these vehicles may not be authorized unless the head of the agency has determined that no other practical means of transportation is available, and that such use is necessary for the health and well-being of officers, employees, and dependents living in remote areas. It is understood that the Bureau of the Budget has approved this proposed legislation, and that this authority has been granted to certain other designated agencies.

The fourth of these proposals, S. 3200, is a substitute for a previous bill, S. 608, introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, to authorize an increase in the per diem allowance of Secret Service agents assigned to the protection of the President and the Vice President. The new bill accords with the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and practically all other Federal agencies, that the Committee on Government Operations should give consideration to extending the maximum subsistence allowance to employees of all Federal agencies who are in travel status, from \$9 to \$12 per diem. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has submitted to the Committee on Government Operations detailed information in support of its position that such an increase is warranted, together with estimates as to the additional costs that would be involved.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John A. Danaher, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit;

James Lewis McCarrey, Jr., of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, district of Alaska;

Theodore F. Stevens, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska, vice Everett W. Hepp, resigned;

Donald E. Kelley, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado;

W. Wilson White, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina;

Duncan Wilmer Daugherty, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia;

Archie M. Meyer, of Arizona, to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona, vice Benjamin J. McKinney, retired;

William Raab, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska, vice Frank Golden, resigned;

Charles Peyton McKnight, Jr., of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas, vice Stanford C. Stiles;

Hobart Kelliston McDowell, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas, vice James R. Wright, resigned; and

Emmett Mitchell Smith, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas, vice Clifton C. Carter.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the Water Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has set an additional hearing for next week on a matter of immediate interest to all interested in the shipping industry.

On Monday, April 5, Senate bill 2370, to authorize the sale of certain ships to Brazil, will be under consideration. This hearing will begin at 10 a. m.

The hearing will be held in room G-16 of the Capitol.

#### GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent



residence to certain aliens. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered (7) and (8).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) and agree to the same.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,  
PAT MCCARRAN,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
RUTH THOMPSON,  
FRANCIS E. WALTER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, certain aliens in the United States who are, in fact, displaced persons may apply for adjustment of their immigration status to that of permanent residents. If the Attorney General approves the application, the case is then submitted to the Congress for affirmative congressional approval. House Joint Resolution 238 as it passed the House of Representatives recorded congressional approval of a number of these cases. Thereafter, the Senate committee added the names of eight aliens whose cases had been recommended by the Attorney General. Thereafter, the House approved the inclusion of 6 of the 8 cases which were added by the Senate. The disapproval of the 2 remaining cases by the House was occasioned by the fact that the 2 cases were adjusted to permanent residents by other administrative processes.

The net effect of the conference report is for the Senate to agree to the elimination from House Joint Resolution 238 of those two cases which have been adjusted by other administrative processes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The report was agreed to.

#### PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF DR. MARCUS WHITMAN—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there is on the desk House Concurrent Resolution 196, providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of Dr. Marcus Whitman, which is identical with Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, which has been agreed to by the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that House Concurrent Resolution 196 be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### STANDING SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on February 16, 1954, I submitted Senate Resolution 213, providing for the establishment of the present Select Small Business Committee as a standing committee of the Senate. Since that time I have received communications from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], asking that they may join as cosponsors. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of those three Senators be added cosponsors, and, if the resolution is reprinted, that their names appear thereon as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT SUPPORT PRICE PROGRAM FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, did the Senator from Minnesota refer to the 75-percent support price program for dairy products in the remarks which he just made?

Mr. THYE. No. I was referring to a resolution relating to the establishment of a small-business committee as a standing committee of the Senate. I submitted a resolution with reference to it some time ago. The question of the dairy price-support program is not before the Senate at this time. I wish it were before us for consideration this afternoon.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the fact that the 75-percent support program will go into effect on April 1, unless some action is taken by Congress to postpone it, I wonder what the Senator from Minnesota feels is the prospect of getting such greatly needed action to protect the interests of dairymen before that date.

Mr. THYE. I regret that I must inform my friend that I cannot make any suggestion. I know of nothing that I can do that would bring about immediate action. I have endeavored to secure some action, but I have not been successful.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator feel that a simple resolution, continuing the present program until the question can be fully considered by the appropriate committees, would meet with favor in both the House and Senate?

Mr. THYE. It would meet with favor, so far as I am concerned, and I am quite certain that there are many other Senators who share the feeling I have with reference to the question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Setting aside temporarily the present unfinished business and making such a resolution the pending order of business is about the only hope we have for relief for the dairymen, is it not?

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to join with the Senator in hoping that may be done, because there is a great deal of distress among the dairy farmers in my own State, as there is in many other States.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

#### AMERICA-ISRAEL SOCIETY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, as a member and one of the founders of the America-Israel Society, I have been greatly impressed by the splendid progress which this new organization has been making. Created to provide Americans with a better appreciation of the culture of Israel, and to encourage that nation to a better understanding of America and our way of life, the society can be of tremendous value not only to Israel and America, but to the free people throughout the world.

In this connection, I have prepared a statement on the America-Israel Society, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES WITH REGARD TO THE AMERICA-ISRAEL SOCIETY

On May 11, according to an announcement recently issued, members of a new association, the America-Israel Society, will attend a dinner in the Hotel Statler, here in Washington, for a highly significant purpose—to honor the creative spirit of the people of Israel, a nation which attained independence only 6 years ago.

I believe this event deserves special note, for, in a sense, it marks another advance in the maturing relations between this country and Israel, a recognition by Americans of the importance of the interchange of cultural information in the lives of nations if there is to be continuing understanding. It is an advance with which I am proud to be associated.

The America-Israel Society is nonpartisan and nonpolitical. Its sole aim is to bring about a better understanding between the American people and the people of Israel and to foster between the two peoples an increasing cultural interchange. The people of Israel look with much admiration upon our achievements, not only in the areas of industry and commerce, but also in the areas of cultural attainment, whether in literature, painting, architecture, or other manifestations of our cultural spirit. They believe that we have much to give them, and they, I believe, have much to give us.

In that tiny land there are a great many men and women who were once distinguished for their cultural attainments in the homelands from which they were so ruthlessly driven—both by fascism and communism. Readjusting their lives in a new environment, they are beginning to recreate the old arts in a different atmosphere. And since they are, by the necessities of the case, a people possessing not one common language but many common languages, they are translating much of the literature of the world into the projected common language of Hebrew. High on the list of translations are the great American masters, ranging from Emerson and Mark Twain to such modern-day giants as Hemingway and Faulkner. English is widely spoken and read in Israel, and American books of all kinds outrank all foreign books in publication, while the greediness of the people to read is so great that bookshops are common throughout the country.

In another field, I am glad to say that the American people remain a churchgoing, Bible-reading, God-fearing people. Every year the Bible remains the best-selling book in the United States. It is, therefore, of great interest to us that scholars of Israel are engaged in constant archeological studies and research that throw new light upon the origins of the Bible. And it is particularly interesting, I think, that these researches tend to show that—doubters to the contrary notwithstanding—the Bible is

firmly rooted in fact. Many of our biblical scholars constantly interchange information with the biblical scholars of Israel, and so, aiding one another, aid all of us in the understanding of the book that is the foundation of our moral, political, spiritual, and ethical lives.

It is not too much to expect that, although the State of Israel is now in its infancy and is beset by a host of growing pains, there will spring from her hallowed soil not only new expressions of the arts that would enrich us as civilized peoples, but that there will also come perhaps a new flowering of faith in God among all men everywhere—that faith without which man is a blind creature walking directionless on the cold crust of a cold earth.

We know that in the field of botany miracles have been wrought by crossbreeding and that equal miracles have sprung from the crossbreedings of cultures. It is then my hope, and that of all men who would see humanity constantly moving upward, that we shall give liberally to Israel of our cultural gifts and that she, in turn, will give us or hers, to the end that we may both benefit.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on a previous occasion I have commented on the unfortunate and what seems to me to be the ill-advised action of the House Appropriations Committee in cutting the State Department's request for the Educational Exchange Service of our overseas information and good-will program from \$15 million to \$9 million for the coming fiscal year.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of Sunday, March 21.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### GOOD WILL PLOWED UNDER

Much as we appreciate the need for economy, it is difficult to understand why the House slashed so deeply into the educational exchange service of the overseas information and good-will program. The State Department's request for \$15 million for continuation of the program at about its present level was cut to \$9 million and of this \$7,500,166 would go for the purchase of foreign credits in the United States Treasury. Some of the foreign credits would not be usable because they could be expended only for transportation and no dollar funds would be available to support students after their arrival. The result would be a most drastic curtailment of activities that have been earning good will and understanding for the United States the world over.

According to Senator FULBRIGHT, the cut would practically put out of business the student-exchange program that bears his name. In the case of 46 countries, including all the republics of Latin America, the exchange of students with the United States would be completely cut off. Plans for bringing so-called leaders of thought and attitude from 70 different countries, to acquaint them with the American way of life, would have to be dropped if the decision of the House should be sustained. And the same is true of the plan for sending American specialists abroad and of the teacher-exchange program designed to familiarize students abroad with American educational methods, customs, and ideas.

Is it possible that the House deliberately voted this false economy? American security, world peace, and in considerable measure

prosperity depend upon continued close and friendly relations with other countries of the free world. The educational exchange program is one of the best means devised for promotion of understanding between peoples. It cannot be sacrificed without serious loss of the cement needed to hold the free world together. Every believer in free-world cooperation will hope that the Senate will vote to give the administration the funds it needs to make this device for building good will effective.

#### TREATY STATUS OF UNITED STATES-JAPANESE MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 8, 1954, in Tokyo, Japan, Japanese Foreign Minister Katsuo Okazaki and our American Ambassador, John M. Allison, in a ceremony held at the Foreign Office, signed a Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement between Japan and the United States of America. At the same time they signed a series of three other related agreements pertaining to the purchase of agricultural commodities, economic arrangements, guaranty of investments, and arrangements for the return of equipment under the mutual defense assistance agreement. These agreements were executive agreements, but they might also be construed as treaties. When we were advised of them, I was under the impression that the mutual security legislation on which they were based was adequate to authorize the execution of these agreements without the necessary treaty formalities with the requirement of the advice and consent of the Senate.

In light of this fact, however, under date of March 15, I addressed to the Secretary of State a communication raising the question whether executive agreements of this nature require any action by the Congress, in addition to the legislation already in existence, and especially whether these undertakings should be considered as treaties needing the advice and consent of the Senate.

Under date of March 23, I received a letter from Mr. Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, acting for the Secretary of State, and replying to my inquiry.

Because of the importance of this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks in the body of the RECORD the reply to my inquiry from the Secretary of State, through Mr. Morton.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, March 23, 1954.

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of March 15, 1954, which raises the question whether the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement and other agreements signed with Japan on March 8 should be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. You are, of course, correct in your assumption that these agreements may be concluded without the advice and consent of the Senate because they are authorized by the mutual security legislation, but I am glad to have the question raised so that we may be sure that we have resolved any doubts you may have.

I should first like to point out that these agreements are substantially similar in form and content to many others which have been negotiated over the past few years in connection with the mutual security program, and that they conform in all essential respects to standard patterns with which the Congress is familiar. In accordance with procedures which were established in May 1953, these agreements, like all other international agreements which have been negotiated since that time, were carefully checked in advance by the staff of Mr. Herman Phleger, the Legal Adviser of this Department, to insure that it was proper to conclude them without the advice and consent of the Senate. Under these procedures, no negotiations of executive agreements are undertaken without prior authorization in writing by the Secretary or the Under Secretary, and the agreements to which you refer were so approved on the basis of the clear statutory authorization contained in the mutual security legislation.

The principal agreement, dealing with the mutual defense assistance program, is required and authorized by section 402 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, which provides that "The President shall, prior to the furnishing of assistance to any eligible nation, conclude agreements with such nation," and prescribes certain of the terms which must be included in a mutual defense assistance agreement.

The mutual defense assistance agreements concluded pursuant to this section do not in themselves determine the nature and the level of the military assistance to be given the foreign country, but merely set forth certain terms and conditions on which any such assistance will be provided. Article I of the agreement with Japan states that "Each Government . . . will make available to the other . . . such equipment, materials, services, or other assistance as the Government furnishing such assistance may authorize" and provides that any assistance furnished by the United States will be furnished under the terms, conditions, and termination provisions of the authorizing legislation and appropriation acts dealing with the mutual security program. Since it is necessary each year to secure from Congress authority and funds to conduct the mutual security program for the following year, Congress will have the opportunity to review, on an annual basis, the military assistance which is planned for Japan. Thus, in presenting the mutual security program to Congress last year, it was indicated that we intended to give military assistance to Japan under that program upon the conclusion of the required agreement, and this year's presentation will give Congress an opportunity to consider again the plans for military assistance to Japan. These plans are directed exclusively toward increasing the capability of Japan to defend itself against internal subversion and external attack, with a view toward enhancing the security of the Pacific area and thereby making it possible for us gradually to withdraw our forces from Japanese territory.

The additional agreements which were signed with Japan at the time of the signing of the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement are also authorized by the mutual security legislation. The purchase agreement and the agreement on economic arrangements were concluded pursuant to section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, and provide respectively for the sale to Japan of American surplus agricultural commodities and for the use of the sales proceeds as authorized by section 550. The agreement regarding guaranty of investments is being concluded pursuant to section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and section 520 of the Mutual Security Act.



If you would like any additional information on the agreements signed with Japan on March 8, I would of course be delighted to go into the subject in greater detail.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,  
Assistant Secretary  
(For the Secretary of State).

#### THE MCCARTHY ISSUE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on yesterday there appeared in the New York Times a very interesting editorial entitled "The McCarthy Issue." The editorial clearly, concisely, and, I believe, with great accuracy sets forth and discusses the issues involved in the McCarthy inquiry which I hope will be undertaken without further delay. The editorial is of such great importance that I ask unanimous consent to have it published in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### THE MCCARTHY ISSUE

The inquiry of the McCarthy committee into the case of McCarthy versus the Army is supposed to begin this week. It has already been postponed too long. But no matter what the reasons may be for delay, they must be overcome so that the hearings can begin at the earliest possible moment. If there are any parties to this dispute, or any politicians concerned with it, who think that a few more days' delay will cause public interest to disappear and the issues to go away of their own accord, they are very much mistaken.

It seems to us that there has been a good deal of confusion, some of it purposely generated, over just what issues are involved, and we think it may be helpful to try to clarify the problem. In the first place, there is the immediate issue of the word of Senator McCarthy and his chief counsel, Roy M. Cohn, against the word of Secretary Stevens and his chief counsel, John G. Adams. On the one hand, Senator McCarthy and Mr. Cohn are accused of seeking special privileges in the Army for their protégé and friend, G. David Schine. On the other hand, the Army spokesmen are accused, in Senator McCarthy's ugly word, of trying to blackmail the McCarthy committee into dropping its investigation of alleged coddling of Communists in the Army.

If either of these charges should prove to be indisputably true that would not alone disprove the truth of the other charge. What the coming investigation has to do—and we emphatically think that the wrong committee has been picked to conduct this investigation, but that is water over the dam—is to go to the root of all the charges and to determine exactly what was said and what did happen. The public will be satisfied with nothing less, and it should be satisfied with nothing less. This, then, is the immediate issue over the facts; and yet it is by no means the fundamental issue in this dispute.

In the second place, there is the issue raised by Senator McCarthy and his friends, the issue of whether or not the Army should have given an honorable discharge to a dental officer who had pleaded the fifth amendment, and the corollary issue of whether or not the commanding general of Camp Kilmer, along with the rest of the Army "brass," has really been coddling Communists. This has become the most completely false and phony issue that could be imagined.

The Army in the person of Secretary Stevens long ago said that a mistake had been made in the Peress case, and that procedures would be revised accordingly. To suggest on the basis of this case and other similar cases, if there are any, that the Army is either riddled with Communists or is soft on Communists is insulting to the intelligence.

Senator McCarthy's effort to make the Nation believe that he has discovered the evils of communism in or out of the Army and that he is the only one doing anything about it is pure political fakery. There is not the slightest doubt—nor was there long before Mr. McCarthy emerged from Wisconsin—as to where the American people and the American Government stand on the question of communism. This certainly is not and never was the issue, let Mr. McCarthy try hard as he will to make it so. Nor is the issue the right of congressional committees to make investigations. Of course they have that right; but they also have the obligation to keep their investigations within constitutional bounds.

The real and fundamental issue, once the immediate question of fact has been disposed of, is whether or not the American people are going to stand any longer for the disruption of orderly governmental processes that Mr. McCarthy and his kind represent. The real issue is whether Mr. McCarthy is going to be permitted to continue to encroach on the executive prerogative; whether he is going to be permitted to destroy the constitutional relationship between the executive and legislative branches of Government; whether he is going to be permitted to undermine the Bill of Rights. Reduced to the political level, it becomes an issue of whether he is going to be permitted to capture control of the Republican Party.

These are the deep-seated issues in the battle between Senator McCarthy and the American people; and the administration will fail to recognize these issues at its peril.

#### GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the National Community Relations Advisory Council, on behalf of 5 national and 31 local Jewish agencies throughout the country, has prepared a statement of guiding principles for legislative investigating committees. It is a very thoughtful statement and, in my judgment, a very useful one. There are in it a few points which I have not had a chance to think through thoroughly; but, expressing as it does, the views of organizations representing many thousands of Americans, I think it merits the consideration of every Member of the Senate.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the statement and the list of all the organizations and agencies subscribing to it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and list of organizations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### THE HIGHEST GOOD: INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE— A STATEMENT OF GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

The large number of congressional investigations into virtually every aspect of our national life, especially into the acutely sensitive areas of loyalty and internal security, has emphasized anew the problem of reconciling competing public interests.

The proper exercise of the legislative function assumes that the legislature will be empowered to acquire information necessary to the intelligent and effective formulation of

legislative recommendations. Indeed there is a legitimate need for wide public knowledge about the conduct of government and the administration of public office. Congressional committee investigations in the past unquestionably have made notable contributions leading to the enactment of significant legislation and the detection of corruption in government.

##### FAIR HEARINGS

Public concern over the conduct of current investigations does not stem from hostility to legislative investigating committees as such but from the absence of controls over committee activities and from the excesses which some committee members have, therefore, been free to indulge in. The need for Congress to be informed cannot justify or excuse abandoning the fair hearings that Americans traditionally have thought inseparable from any just system of laws. Recent events have underscored the importance of insuring that witnesses or other persons affected by proceeding before investigating committees will not be unjustly accused or degraded, that they will not be forced to a public avowal and justification of wholly irrelevant private beliefs, and that all persons summoned to testify will receive opportunity for full and fair explanation of any acts called into question.

We pride ourselves on having created a government of laws rather than of men. The legislative investigating committee, because it functions without statutory restraints, remains the outstanding exception to this general principle. It enables irresponsible individuals without check by regulatory standard to exercise profound, often disastrous, influence over the lives of others. It denies those who have been pilloried any basis for defense or appeal.

##### JEWISH CONCERN FOR DEMOCRATIC FREEDOMS

As part of a democratic society whose security ultimately depends on the maintenance of a sound and healthy political structure, Jews must share the concern of all groups in America over encroachments upon individual liberties. Democracy is indivisible. No one of its fundamental features can be vitiated or destroyed without imperiling the whole. Neither the Jewish community nor any other segment of our population can afford to be complacent or aloof when confronted with consistent assaults upon individual freedoms.

The threat of communism to free institutions everywhere must be faced. A common and fundamental theme of both Judaism and democracy is the concern with the sanctity and dignity of the individual. Our Jewish history and tradition have inspired a devotion to the principle of individual liberty and have rendered us sensitive to any attacks on human freedom. Accordingly, Jewish organizations have consistently opposed communism and repudiated the limitations on freedom which inhere in it and in the methods it employs.

##### ORDERLY PROCESS

The advantages of congressional investigations can be retained and yet made compatible with individual liberties if we introduce in this area the orderly processes that characterize our other legal institutions. For this purpose we propose the following guiding principles for the conduct of legislative investigating committees. Adoption of these principles by our legislatures will, we believe, insure fairness to the individual witness or person affected by the conduct of the hearing. They will aid the committees in discovering the facts involved in the inquiry and will strengthen and bolster public confidence in legislative investigations.

These principles express our belief that in this country individual justice constitutes the highest common good.

Congress should enact a code of fair procedures binding upon its investigating committees based upon the following principles:

1. Congressional investigations should be limited in scope to those matters in which Congress may legislate or exercise any other power specifically granted by the Constitution. The obtaining of evidence for use in criminal prosecutions or educating the public at best should be a byproduct but never the primary purpose of a congressional investigation.

The congressional power to investigate is not specifically stated in the Constitution. It is an implied one sanctioned by the courts to make effective the other powers of Congress. Lacking a general power to investigate, Congress can only conduct inquiries to gather information for legislative purposes and to check on the administration and enforcement of law and the economy and efficiency of Government. A congressional committee therefore must not function as a grand jury. Nor should it exercise its powers for the purpose of exposing individuals or holding them up to public scorn.

2. One-man investigating committees should be prohibited. All phases of an investigation, including the authorization of subsidiary inquiries, the hiring of staff, the scheduling of hearings, the subpoenaing of witnesses and the releasing of public statements and reports, should represent the considered judgment of the majority of the committee. Sworn testimony should be taken only in the presence of at least two members of a committee.

When Congress authorizes a committee to conduct an investigation, it contemplates that all important decisions in its course will be taken after due deliberation by all members of the committee. A committee should not delegate its powers to one of its members and a committee chairman should not usurp the powers of other committee members. Full committee deliberation prevents abuse of power, arbitrary or capricious action and partisan exploitation of a committee's function. It is particularly important that a witness who runs the risk of criminal prosecution for contempt of a committee that lacks the procedural safeguards afforded in other proceedings should not be compelled to testify before only one committee member.

3. To insure full deliberation, all members of investigating committees should receive due notice of meetings and other committee action. Adequate provision should be made for minority reports.

4. Material reflecting adversely upon persons living or dead should not be made public before an opportunity has been afforded such persons or their representatives to refute derogatory or defamatory statements. Rebuttal testimony should be released simultaneously with publication of such material.

The practice of condemning individuals or organizations without giving them an opportunity to defend themselves is a serious abuse on the part of a congressional committee, particularly in releasing testimony given in executive session, in offering such testimony at public hearings or in releasing reports not based on any hearings. These are areas which are in particular need of regulation, for such practices, if allowed to continue unchecked, will destroy public confidence in all legislative investigations.

5. Persons or organizations against whom charges are made in public hearings should be afforded an opportunity to present their side of the case publicly as soon as possible after the making of the charge and in circumstances as public as those in which the charge was made. This opportunity should include the right to cross-examine witnesses for a reasonable time.

It is not sufficient to allow persons or organizations exposed to the glare of modern publicity media merely to file with a com-

mittee an affidavit containing their side of the case. To insure elementary fairness and a balanced presentation of both sides of a case, they should be given limited but reasonable facilities to testify before the committee and to cross-examine their accusers. It is no answer to reply that investigating committees are not courts or lack time to play fair. If they lack time to allow an adequate defense to be presented, they should not be permitted to make accusations.

6. Material in the files of an investigating committee, not previously released by the committee in the form of an official report, should be kept confidential and made available only to Federal investigative and intelligence agencies and State prosecution agencies for their official purposes.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has compiled dossiers on at least a half-million American citizens. These dossiers are not balanced evaluations of a person's career but mere compilations of undigested material deemed derogatory, as the Bishop Oxnham hearing demonstrated. These dossiers, never authorized by Congress, have in the past been made available indiscriminately although they are able to ruin a person's career or blast his reputation. Such material should be confidential, as are similar materials in the files of the FBI, and should be similarly restricted.

7. Committee members or employees should not issue any public evaluation of a person under investigation until the inquiry relating to such person has been completed and a committee report thereon adopted.

The principle that this is a Government of laws and not men requires at least that no person should be held up to public scorn by the offhand comments of a single committee member or staff employee. No public interest is lost or jeopardized by a requirement that no person be stigmatized except by the committee investigating him and then only after it has completed its investigation and has heard his side of the case.

8. No hearing of a legislative investigating committee should be photographed, televised, broadcast, or recorded for radio over a witness' objection.

It is indeed anomalous that in our courtrooms where parties are protected by counsel and judges, radio, television, and cameras are forbidden but in congressional hearing rooms public exhibitions are often staged. Such exploitation should be forbidden whenever the witness objects, because of the tendency to distract, confuse, and often frighten a witness and because of the inevitable sensationalism that results, preventing a calm, decorous, and fair account of what is happening.

9. Investigating committees should be empowered to invoke the aid of the courts in compelling answers to questions. Constitutional objections and questions of privilege raised by a witness should be tested through summary judicial procedures rather than by defenses in criminal prosecutions.

A witness who refuses to answer a pertinent question put to him by a congressional committee, thereby commits a misdemeanor and may be jailed for 1 year. Moreover, a witness who refuses to answer does so at his peril, even if he is acting in good faith and on the advice of competent counsel and although he may have reasonable grounds upon which to refuse. This criminal sanction is not only too drastic and inflexible but also is cumbersome and long drawn out. A congressional committee, like any administrative agency possessing the power to compel testimony, should be able to resort to the courts to compel answers in lieu of criminal prosecution that does not result in answers. Such judicial procedures should also provide a forum to test questions of privilege raised by a witness. Frivolous or dilatory objections can be dealt with summarily by the courts.

10. The Rules Committee of each House of Congress should be empowered to receive and investigate complaints of abuses of congressional investigating committees and to report its findings and recommendations to the Congress.

To provide some way of enforcing these rules of procedure, complaints to the Rules Committee of each House should be authorized. These committees may in appropriate cases recommend to the full House censure of committee or committee members and, where abuses are more flagrant, even more drastic sanctions. The mere existence of such a remedy will induce fair procedures by investigating committees and promote public confidence in a power so important to the effective functioning of the Congress.

#### NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL

##### CONSTITUENT ORGANIZATIONS

###### National agencies

American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, United Synagogue of America.

###### Local, State, and regional agencies

Jewish Welfare Fund of Akron; Jewish Community Relations Council for Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, Calif.; Baltimore Jewish Council; Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Boston; Jewish Community Council, Bridgeport, Conn.; Brooklyn Jewish Community Council; Community Relations Committee of the Jewish Federation of Camden County, N. J.; Cincinnati Jewish Community Council; Jewish Community Federation, Cleveland, Ohio; Connecticut Jewish Community Relations Council; Detroit Jewish Community Council; Elizabeth, N. J., Jewish Community Council; Jewish Community Council of Essex County, N. J.; Community Relations Committee of the Hartford (Conn.) Jewish Federation; Indiana Jewish Community Relations Council; Indianapolis Jewish Community Relations Council; Community Relations Bureau of the Jewish Federation and Council of Greater Kansas City; Community Relations Committee of the Los Angeles Jewish Community Council; Milwaukee Jewish Council; Minnesota Jewish Council; New Haven Jewish Community Council; Norfolk Jewish Community Council; Philadelphia Jewish Community Relations Council; Jewish Community Relations Council, Pittsburgh; Jewish Community Council, Rochester; Jewish Community Relations Council of St. Louis; Community Relations Council of San Diego; Southwestern Jewish Community Relations Council; San Francisco Jewish Community Relations Council; Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington (D. C.); Jewish Community Relations Council of the Jewish Federation of Youngstown, Ohio.

#### THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this Thursday the House of Representatives Rules Committee is scheduled to take up once again Senate bill 2150, the Wiley bill, for completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway. It is my earnest hope that the Rules Committee will report a rule calling for early consideration of the bill.

I want to say very frankly, however, that there have been many disturbing signs that the Rules Committee will do exactly the opposite, that it will simply delay its final decision until, perhaps, Eastertime. Then, presumably, at that time it can delay until May 1; and on



May 1, bring about another delay, and so forth. At least this is the hope of the Pennsylvania Railroad, the New York Central, and quite a few other railroads which have left no stone unturned in lobbying to delay the seaway.

They know that delay is their only way, at the moment, of trying to frustrate the will of the American people. If they cannot delay the bill, they will try to cripple it by the so-called Brownson amendment.

The eyes of the American people are on the House Rules Committee. The Rules Committee has the opportunity to proclaim whether the Association of American Railroads shall be considered as superior to the needs and desires of 160 million American people, or whether the people's wishes, delayed and sabotaged for 30 years by selfish lobbyists, shall prevail.

The railroads, in their last-ditch lobbying against the seaway, again have proven their blindness. They have opposed every waterway project in American history, contending that "disaster would come" if a new water channel was opened, whether it be the Panama Canal or the St. Lawrence Seaway. The railroads have been wrong before, and they are wrong again.

Fortunately, many enlightened railroad leaders and many fine railroad brotherhood officers and union members are keenly aware that the seaway, far from hurting the railroads, will probably help them by creating more feeder traffic. However, that has not stopped the lobbying of the Pennsylvania Railroad and its cohorts.

I earnestly hope, however, that events within the next brief period will show that the Congress is not going to permit itself to be hoodwinked.

#### EARL L. CANFIELD—NAVY CIVILIAN AWARD

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, last Thursday, March 25, a resident of my State, Earl L. Canfield, of Essex, Conn., received the Navy's highest civilian honor for his outstanding voluntary contribution to the Navy in successfully solving manufacturing problems that were retarding the production, assembly, and delivery of Mighty Mouse, the Navy's folding-fin aircraft rocket. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point the Department of Defense's announcement of this award.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### HIGHEST NAVY CIVILIAN AWARD PRESENTED ORDNANCE EXPERT

Earl L. Canfield, president of the Sight Light Corp. of Deep River, Conn., will receive the Navy's highest civilian honor—the Distinguished Public Service Award—in a ceremony at 2 p. m., Thursday, March 25, 1954, in the office of the Secretary of the Navy Robert B. Anderson, the Navy announced today.

The Secretary will present the award to Mr. Canfield in recognition of his outstanding voluntary contributions to the Navy in successfully solving manufacturing problems

that were retarding the production, assembly, and delivery of Mighty Mouse, the Navy's 2.75 MM folding-fin aircraft rocket.

In his capacity as a member of the Ordnance Advisory Committee of the National Security Industrial Association, Mr. Canfield at his own expense and time devoted 6 months in 1953 to work out the solution of the complicated problems that were retarding manufacture and production of the rocket for the Navy Bureau of Ordnance.

As a result of his ability, advice, and initiative the Bureau was able to greatly accelerate the rate of final assembly and delivery of the rocket, and to effect a large savings of funds through simplification of production techniques.

In recommending Mr. Canfield, who now is secretary of NSIA, for the Navy's top civilian honor, Rear Adm. M. F. Schoeffel, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, stated:

"It is desired to emphasize strongly that in rendering this outstanding service to the Government, the benefits of which are almost incalculable, Mr. Canfield was motivated by the highest principles. Neither he nor his company stood to profit in any way through these accomplishments. In addition, it is to be noted that he transmitted to other commercial manufacturers, possibly competitors in some fields, without remuneration, technical instructions, and production techniques."

Mr. Canfield, whose home is in Essex, Conn., will be accompanied by his wife and son, David, at the ceremony.

Officials of the National Security Industrial Association, including Homer Ewing, president; John J. Hopkins, chairman of the Board of Trustees; H. H. Buttner, trustee, and Fordyce Tuttle, chairman of the Ordnance Advisory Committee, also are expected to attend along with officials of the Navy Bureau of Ordnance.

Mr. Canfield was appraised in March, 1953, of the grave difficulties that were retarding production of the rocket. As a result of his knowledge of production processes and cumulative analyses, he detected the difficulty and suggested a simple means of correcting it. To assure himself of the soundness of the solution he had recommended he made numerous trips to the Bureau of Ordnance, the Naval Ammunition Depot, Shumaker, Ark., the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif., and to plants of several commercial contractors working on the project.

The citation for Mr. Canfield reads:

"The Navy Distinguished Public Service Award is hereby presented to Earl L. Canfield for his outstanding voluntary contributions to the United States Navy in the field of ordnance. Mr. Canfield, through his outstanding initiative, professional ability, and enthusiasm, solved a manufacturing problem which had retarded production of aircraft rockets, resulting in vastly improved delivery rates, simplification of manufacture, and almost incalculable savings of funds. In full appreciation of his valuable services to the Navy and the high order of his patriotism, this award is presented this 25th day of March 1954."

#### JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who is unavoidably detained, had intended to address the Senate today on the subject of juvenile delinquency. On his behalf, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the remarks which he had intended to deliver.

There being no objection, the remarks prepared by Mr. HENDRICKSON were or-

dered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### REMARKS PREPARED BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

Americans are not traditionally a people guilty of moral flabbiness. When they become aware that an evil condition exists they seek to eliminate it. As George Santayana has pointed out—

"To be an American is of itself almost a moral condition."

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, there has come to my attention a wicked and disgusting problem, shocking enough, it would seem, to arouse a feeling of loathing and disgust in any American. It calls for immediate remedy. I do not doubt the unanimity of action the Senate will display in taking the necessary steps to bring about a proper remedy, once the Senate learns the despicable facts of this situation.

I am going to ask the Senate to do all in its power to stop the traffic—commercial traffic, if you will—of the insidious filth which is being specifically aimed at our youth.

I do not speak of just the pocketbook editions and the truly salacious literature which frequently adorn our drugstore newstands. What I wish to call to your attention is the growing illicit trade across our Nation of filthy and perverted films, books, cartoons, pamphlets, recordings, and objects of sex depravity so utterly indecent as to shock every civilized American, were he aware of them. I had a difficult time believing that such lewd stuff existed. And yet our subcommittee staff has learned that virtually every major city across America is being hit with constantly increasing complaints concerning such traffic.

Traffic in insidious filth, which destroys the moral fiber of our youth and our Nation, has become big business. Although our investigations of pornographic literature have just begun, it is estimated that the nationwide traffic in this filth could run from \$100 million to \$300 million a year. Our subcommittee has learned that one operator starting with \$300, had amassed a quarter of a million dollars 2 years later. He dealt in erotic films. Two hundred feet of 8-millimeter film brought him \$15; 400 feet of 16-millimeter film brought him \$25. A few feet of sadistic color film with sound brought \$100.

One great city has destroyed 400,000 feet of such film during the course of a single year.

Those who thus pander shamelessly to the erotic instinct in order to make a filthy dollar at the expense of our youth and our Nation are as dangerous to our national welfare as any Communist conspirator.

Besides the illicit film traffic, millions of black and white and colored photos, almost indescribably pornographic, are peddled by dealers in ever-increasing numbers. Filthy cartoon books in color displaying sex irregularities are sold by these panders to countless teenagers. One mother discovered that her son was using his lunch money to pay to read booklets and look at photos other teenagers had purchased. Parties—or rather, sex parties—are inspired by the panders in order to increase their sales.

No one familiar with the statistics of our divorce courts or of our juvenile courts can doubt that looseness in sex morality has serious social consequences. That is another reason for my grave concern over this particular problem.

Our subcommittee staff has learned that laws pertaining to the sale of lewd and licentious material are totally inadequate to cope with the problem. Local and State laws are weak and our Federal laws even weaker.

Just last week the District of Columbia police arrested a malefactor. It cost \$300 to build the case against him—the cost of

police purchases of his material. He was charged with 10 counts. The court threw out 4. He was fined \$250 on the other 6 counts and given a suspended sentence of a year in jail. In other words, this panderer came out \$50 ahead of his dealings with the police.

In another city the police arrested a man driving a Packard automobile and found 558 rolls of immoral film. His car was confiscated but was soon returned to him and the man was fined a mere \$100.

In the District of Columbia, our investigators were told by Inspector Blick, head of the morals squad, that his men work for months to build a case, make the raid, bring the rascal to trial, and the law is so weak that he gets off with a fine he can make up in half a day.

Their job, the inspector says, is the most frustrating in town. They have even known of a case in which, within 2 hours after a man was found guilty of selling this vile material, he was back in business selling it again. This state of affairs cannot continue.

Our subcommittee is studying all aspects of the situation and will, from time to time, ask the Senate to consider remedial legislation.

The first of such legislation I will shortly offer the Senate. It is designed for the District of Columbia where the situation cries for immediate action. This proposed legislation is but a first step. But it is a vital one, and I am joined in sponsorship by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

In essence, the proposed law would do two things:

1. Make mandatory a jail sentence of not less than 1 year for anyone found guilty a second time of dealing with lewd, immoral, licentious material.

2. Authorize the court to permit the public prosecutor to confiscate and have sold at public auction all cameras, presses, trucks, automobiles and the like which a convicted person may have employed to carry on his traffic in lewd material.

I believe such legislation will so hamper these dealers in filth that they will cease their crimes against our youth and their undermining of the moral structure of our American society.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], at my request, obtained permission to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I had prepared, dealing with a bill which, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I now introduce. I ask that the bill be printed in full at the point where my remarks were printed in the RECORD this morning.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3202) to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. CASE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) section 872 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 22-2001), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 872," and (2) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "unless the violation occurs after he has been convicted of selling, offering to sell, or advertising for sale, any article in violation of this section, in

which case he shall be fined \$1,000, and imprisoned for 1 year."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Any vehicle, fixture, equipment, stock, or other thing of value (including without limitation vehicles, equipment, fixtures, or things adaptable to a lawful use) used or to be used in connection with (1) the sale, distribution, manufacture, or showing of any article or material, or (2) the advertising or staging of any exhibition, the sale or advertising of which is prohibited by subsection (a) of this section, shall be subject to seizure by any member of the Metropolitan Police force or the United States Park Police, or the United States marshal, or any deputy marshal, for the District of Columbia, and shall, unless good cause is shown to the contrary by the owner, be forfeited to the District of Columbia, by order of any court having jurisdiction, for disposition by public auction or as otherwise provided by law. Bona fide liens against property so forfeited shall, on good cause shown by the lienor, be transferred from the property to the proceeds of the sale of the property. Forfeit moneys and other proceeds realized from the enforcement of this section shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia."

#### PUBLICATION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS VOLUMES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been extremely interested in the publication of the vital series entitled "Foreign Relations" by the United States State Department.

Over a period of months I had contacted the Department with the aim of urging the acceleration of the publication of the series and the elimination of the backlog.

I was informed by the Department that, as a result of my own interest as well as that of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Department had set up a 4-year plan for speeding up publication so as to bring the volumes up to within about 10 years of currency, which is certainly a desirable objective, to say the least.

It was with surprise and regret, therefore, that I learned that recently a House Appropriations subcommittee had actually recommended the abolition of the entire Foreign Relations publications program.

Mr. President, I think that is being pennywise and pound foolish.

I can deeply appreciate the desire of my colleagues to effect economy wherever possible.

But I point out that the Foreign Relations volumes represent the official diplomatic history of the United States.

They comprise a project which has been the responsibility of the Department since 1861. They are an invaluable research tool for Members of Congress, foreign service officers, historians, teachers, etc.

I earnestly hope, therefore, that my House and Senate colleagues will provide not only for the continued publication of the series but for acceleration thereof.

The American people are interested not only in where our foreign policy is going but in how it got to its present position.

They are entitled to the facts. The State Department is desirous of giving our people the facts. Our people cannot fully understand the problems of the present and future until they find how we met the problems of the past. I trust that Congress will act accordingly on this appropriations item.

#### THE BANKRUPTCY MYTH AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald on March 26, 1954, entitled "The Bankruptcy Myth and National Security." This article was prepared by Seymour E. Harris, professor of economics, Harvard University.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that following this article there may be inserted in the RECORD the introductory remarks to a speech which I made in the Senate on March 15, 1954. These remarks of mine quote the text of the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in substantiation of the point made by Professor Harris that the reduction in national defense expenditures made by the new administration is not necessary or desirable, from an economic standpoint.

There being no objection, the article and introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times-Herald of March 26, 1954]

#### THE BANKRUPTCY MYTH AND NATIONAL SECURITY

In his reply to Governor Stevenson, Vice President Nixon said of the Democrats that "they know that this (the Democratic military program) would force us into bankruptcy, that we would destroy our freedom in attempting to defend it." (Is this not a reckless charge?) In his budget address, the President said, "We cannot afford to build military strength by sacrificing economic strength." Secretary Humphrey and key Republican Congressmen have made similar statements. It is also evident from testimony of General Bradley and General Ridgway and statements by former Secretary of the Air Force Thomas Finletter and the military strategist, Mr. Hanson Baldwin, that nonmilitary considerations played an excessive part in the determination of military policy. In his campaign Governor Stevenson wisely stressed the priority of security over finance.

It is about time that we repudiated this foolish talk about bankruptcy. (This is aside from the surprising statement made by the Vice President that a financial bankruptcy means a loss of freedom in the same sense as a Communist victory.)

I do not know what the Republican leaders mean by bankruptcy, but they certainly cannot mean inability to meet dollar obligations. Every sovereign power can meet the obligations expressed in its currency.

What are the signs of bankruptcy? Are they the rise since 1933 of gross output of 190 percent, of per capita disposable income (after taxes of 99 percent, of personal consumption expenditures of 227 percent, of gross private investment of 1,386 percent? (All of these are corrected for price changes and hence represent genuine gains.)

Is it a sign of bankruptcy that since the depression thirties the 20 percent of households with the lowest incomes increased their real incomes before taxation (dollars



of stable purchasing power) by 45 percent, and the next 4 quartiles (from high to low incomes) by 41, 29, 22, and 14 percent, respectively? (Similar results are found after taxes.) Note that this improvement in distribution which strengthens our system was consistent with a great rise in output, consumption and investment.

Is it the heavy tax load that spells bankruptcy for the present administration? On this score note that taxes accounted for 26 percent of our gross product as compared with 33½, 34, and 31½ percent for the United Kingdom, Germany, and France. Yet per capita income in the United States was almost 3 times that of the United Kingdom and France and 4 times that of Germany. Surely the tax burden, however annoying, considered relative to per capita income is not bankrupting us. The vast gains of income belie that position.

Is the national debt the troublesome item? Is the administration aware that the national debt, the heritage of our history over the years, as a percentage of our gross national income for but 1 year, declined from 130 percent of our income in 1945 to 75 percent in 1953, or a drop of more than 40 percent? Is it aware that the rise in the cost of financing this debt has been but 2 percent of the rise of income in the last 20 years (\$6 billion against \$309 billion)? This growth of debt probably raised income many times the rise in the cost of financing the debt. Incidentally, I am surprised that the President's speech writers inserted in his tax speech the statement that an increase of deficits passes the burden on to future generations.

Is inflation the measure of impending bankruptcy? In the campaign, the Republicans made much of the 50-cent dollar. They failed, however, to note that there were four times as many dollars around and hence that all dollars were worth twice as much as before the war.

They also failed to note that the inflation was a byproduct of a great and medium-sized war; that accompanying the inflation of the last 20 years had been a rise of output of almost 2 times; that the moderation of inflation as measured by the relation of price rise to percentage of income going to war was unprecedented (the inflation on this basis was but one-fourteenth that to be expected from the experience during the Civil War and one-third that to be expected from the experience of World War I).

From all of this I conclude that the administration is endangering our security by overrelying on financial considerations. They are reducing our military strength and depending too much on the atomic bomb because they believe we face financial disaster if Truman military policies are continued.

I stress the point that the Government cut military outlays by \$4 billion when, according to all forecasts, gross national product in 1954 is likely to fall by 5 percent or more (or at least \$17 billion) because of inadequate spending, and besides failing to gain, as it normally does, by \$11 billion. Hence, here, because of insufficient spending, is a loss of \$28 billion. An increased outlay of ten to fifteen billion dollars for security would save us from unnecessary wastage of resources and add (through secondary effects) ten to fifteen billion dollars of income to our private economy.

The point I make here is not that we should spend for military purposes in order to keep our economy healthy. There are much more productive ways of spending money. What I am stressing is that we should not, in weighing financial considerations excessively, endanger our defense. Furthermore, reduced spending would not bolster our economy now—rather the reverse—for our economy now requires more, not less, spending.

Finally, I note that the National Planning Association showed ("Can We Afford Addi-

tional Programs for National Security," October, 1953) that an "additional program of \$10 billion by 1956 (above the administration's projected outlays) would not interfere with further business expansion and would not prevent a continuing increase in the standard of living." (Even tax reduction would be had.) A rise of \$20 billion of security outlays by 1956 above the administration's proposed outlays "would permit a continuing increase in investment and at least a moderate increase in the standard of living." (Tax rates unchanged.) A rise of outlays by \$33 billion "would represent a considerable rise from the peak level of the present program, not only in absolute amount but also in the ratio to total production. It would leave enough resources only for small increases in investments and standards of living. It would require an increase in taxes. \* \* \*

In summary, the administration is being misled by unknowledgeable advisers. We have too many Secretaries of the Treasury and too few Secretaries of Defense. These false prophets of bankruptcy are "the prophets of gloom" because they underestimate our economic strength, and by weakening our military position they increase the probability of world war III and hence of bankruptcy.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS,  
Professor of Economics, Harvard  
University.  
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Mr. President, before undertaking a discussion of taxes and our national economy, I should like to call attention to the following excerpt from pages 5 and 6 of the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

**"ECONOMIC CAPACITY FOR ADEQUATE DEFENSE PROGRAM"**

"The (President's) Economic Report states that 'Our approach to a position of military preparedness now makes it possible to turn the productive potentialities of the economy increasingly to peaceful purposes.'"

"We welcome this opportunity to reduce military expenditures and do not view with pessimism the adjustments involved in making this transition."

"It is beyond the jurisdiction of this committee to pass judgment upon the adequacy of our military preparedness. It is not our function to determine how many air wings, ships, or divisions are necessary."

"However, we do feel it is within our jurisdiction to state that, in our opinion, the economy is capable of meeting safely additional military expenditures if such expenditures are necessary for our military security."

"This is not a recommendation for more spending for national-security purposes. It is rather an assertion that reductions in these programs, which have been made and which are projected for the future, should be justified upon their merits, and not upon the premise that they are made necessary for economic reasons."

To my mind, this section calls for a new look at the New Look, a reexamination of our national-defense program.

We have heard a great deal about the New Look. Much of this discussion has been in terms of assurances from the administration that we are getting "more bang for a buck."

Only the most naive could believe that the reductions in military expenditures, made and to be made, have strengthened our defense. I do not believe anyone seriously questions the fact that substantial reductions were made out of a belief that the economy could not stand greater expenditures.

I do not quarrel with this approach. Obviously, our national security requires that economic as well as military considerations must be taken into account.

What I do quarrel with is the administration's estimate of the strength of our economy.

I believe the administration has seriously underestimated the capabilities of our economy and its fundamental strength. They believed it had to be shaken down; that it was operating at a pace which could not be maintained. They did not appreciate that during the 2 years immediately preceding January 1953 the economy of the United States was—

1. Conducting a great military operation in Korea, halfway around the world;

2. Accumulating a great store of military equipment against the possibility of world war III;

3. Building a broad industrial base for fighting such a war and maintaining the lead in scientific and engineering developments; and

4. Doing all that, we still were maintaining a standard of living for the masses of our people higher than that of any previous time or any other country.

This was the situation as accurately described to the Joint Economic Committee by a sound and conservative economist.

Failing to appreciate the strength of our economy, the administration has proceeded to reduce its preparedness goals to fit its own image of the country's capabilities. This image was too small.

So I suggest that our military planners and the Appropriations Committees and Armed Services Committees of the Congress should reappraise our preparedness programs in the light of this admonition of the Joint Economic Committee's report:

"Reductions in these programs, which have been made and which are projected for the future, should be justified upon their own merits, and not upon the premise that they are made necessary for economic reasons."

I have made these few remarks upon our military program as a prelude to a discussion of taxes and our national economy. I have done so from the belief that our first duty—before considering tax reduction—is to reappraise our military posture. Only as we can satisfy ourselves that our military program is adequate can we afford to consider significant tax reduction.

**CALL OF THE ROLL**

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ANSWER TO ALAN BARTH'S CRITICISM OF THE FBI**

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in March of this year there appeared in Harper's magazine an article entitled "How Good Is an FBI Report?" written by Mr. Alan Barth. If I were asked to select one agency of the Federal Government in which the American people have implicit faith, I would choose the FBI. This agency has always conducted itself in a proper manner and has never been brought into the white spotlight of public criticism until the present time. Because I feel a great pride in this institution, and because I feel that I share this pride with all Americans, I cannot

let go unanswered this article to which I referred, which was written by an eminent writer for the Washington Post, Mr. Alan Barth. If Mr. Barth had followed a logical path to his conclusions, and if he had substantiated his remarks by way of higher authority, I feel he would have believed his conclusions unjustified and would have withheld publication of his story.

The FBI has been the chief target of attack by Communists, their stooges, and apologists for years. A new effort is now apparent. The Daily Worker, Communist leaders, and apologists have been seeking a way to impede and thwart the FBI in its job of protecting our internal security. Frequently, they overplay their hands and expose themselves as the despicable swindlers that they are. One of the most notorious was the insidious Red master of stealth, Max Lowenthal. Long a friend of persons in high office, he was able to accomplish deeds of staggering proportions which benefited the Red masters of the Kremlin.

The author, Alan Barth, long a top-ranking editorial writer for the Washington Post, has come forward with an alibi as to why Communists were not weeded out of the Government. Barth's explanation in his article, *How Good Is an FBI Report?*, is so simple that it is rather ridiculous and it shows Barth to be either unaware of the truth or unwilling to develop it.

As written, it appears that Barth's purpose is to raise the bugaboo of secret police in an effort to undermine public respect for constituted authority. Like Max Lowenthal, Barth shows himself to be a master of adroit misrepresentation.

He would have his readers believe he is an expert in FBI procedure and security practices when he seeks to place the blame on the FBI for the failure to get Communists out of Government. That is why I feel it necessary to call attention to this new smear campaign against the FBI and expose it for what it appears to be—a deliberate misrepresentation of truth. In doing so, I defend the right of Alan Barth to express his opinions, but I feel it necessary to call attention to the fact that he has no right to misstate the truth.

In the first place, what are the qualifications of the author to sit in judgment on the contents of FBI reports and by virtue of what authority is he able to give the alibi to Government officials who failed to act when warned?

He has been an editorial writer for the Washington Post since 1943. For brief periods, he worked in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury and in the Office of War Information.

The June 1946 issue of *Reader's Scope* contains an article by Barth against the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This publication, it will be recalled, was published by Leverett Gleason, a director of the People's Radio Foundation and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, both well-known Communist fronts.

For years, Barth has denounced loyalty programs, and his heart has bled for Communists, their stooges, spies, and persons whose acts were akin to treason.

The only conclusion I can reach is that the purpose of his Harper's article is intended as a defense for keeping Harry Dexter White, Harold Glasser, Duncan Lee, Sol Adler, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, Alger Hiss, Frank Coe, Lauchlin Currie, and others of a similar ilk in the Government. The premise of this defense is the novel one that information in FBI reports is culled sometimes from knaves and nitwits, sometimes from bigots, sometimes from persons whose devotion to the United States ought to be suspect, sometimes from men or women with axes to grind or hatchets to bury in the skulls of employees whom they dislike. He here makes a fraudulent representation, because there is not a Member of Congress who has not time and again furnished information to FBI agents which is recorded in their reports, unless Mr. Barth, who has not been known to evidence much respect for the people's elected representatives, lists us in the category of "knaves and nitwits." Furthermore, the FBI reports have been scrutinized by experts in Government as well as by the courts and have not been found wanting.

By his own admission, he states that FBI reports are confidential and that only in rare instances have FBI reports been made available, but then he proceeds, as though with some omnipotent power, to rule on all FBI reports despite the fact that very few have ever become available. In fact he refers to only four reports in his entire article. What kind of thorough study is this? How is he able to say that FBI reports as a whole are deficient? He cannot honestly make this statement, because he frankly does not know.

At one point, he quotes a former attorney general as saying FBI reports include leads and suspicions and sometimes statements of malicious persons as a reason for not making reports public. But he omits the very next sentence of former Attorney General Jackson's statement which reads as follows:

Even though later and more complete reports exonerate the individuals, the use of particular or selected reports might constitute the grossest injustice, and we all know that a correction never catches up with an accusation. (Opinion of Attorney General, Apr. 30, 1941.)

He furthermore does not quote the major reason for keeping FBI files confidential, namely, that their disclosure would prejudice the national defense and would lend aid and comfort to the very subversive elements against which we must protect our country.

He illustrates his incompetence to pass on security matters when he questions the pertinency of information put into the record of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on Solomon Adler, by asking "What inference is a reader of this report supposed to draw from this information?" after setting forth Adler's connections with high Government officials in China in 1946-47 and the fact that Adler was critical of the Chinese Nationalists.

Mr. Barth literally pleads Adler's case, insisting that, since Adler remained in

the Government until 1950, since he was cleared by the same Civil Service Loyalty Review Board which cleared Remington, and since he was not indicted, he must be lily pure. Naturally, Adler stayed in the Government so long as he could be protected by such stalwarts as Harry Dexter White. The FBI could have submitted a dozen reports, and it would have made little difference, for example, if White was sitting in judgment, because his sponsor was White.

Again we find evidence of disregard for the facts. Since he questioned one of the proceedings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, he must have been familiar with what transpired at that session. Prior to receiving the information he questions, testimony of Whittaker Chambers was presented disclosing that J. Peters, the Soviet agent, had told him that Adler was sending a weekly report to the American Communist Party; and Elizabeth Bentley had testified that Adler was a member of the Silvermaster group, paid his dues through Silvermaster, submitted reports to the Soviets through Harry Dexter White, and made Communist contacts in China. It was further developed at the same hearing that Adler had left the country after leaving his job in the Treasury Department in May, 1950. It was pointed out in the same report that even the American Embassy in London had been instructed to pick up Adler's passport. The Internal Security Subcommittee tried to get Adler's testimony, but obviously could not after he had left the country. The fact that Adler had been reported to be a Communist certainly makes most pertinent the information that he was a participant in high level conferences in China and kept on the Government's payroll.

As a further illustration of the fraud perpetrated on the reading public by the author in his Harper's magazine article, he makes reference to the Remington case. Here he politely called J. Edgar Hoover a liar because of Mr. Hoover's testimony under oath before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security that the information furnished by Elizabeth Bentley, which was susceptible to check, had proven to be correct.

This, he says, is not so as far as "her testimony has been evaluated by juries" is concerned. With a display of a deft use of words, always characteristic of one gifted in dialectics, Mr. Barth relates that Miss Bentley made three charges against Remington: that he was a member of the Communist Party, that he paid party dues to her, and that he gave her material which she was not authorized to receive. He then claims the Government dropped the first count, there was a hung jury on the second count, and a guilty verdict on the third count.

Mr. Barth is entitled to advance any opinion or conclusion he desires, but when he takes to the pages of Harper's, he has a responsibility to be accurate in setting forth his facts. This he has not done. A court record on a conviction is a public record which Mr. Barth could check. If he did check, then his



misrepresentations are all the more reprehensible. The record, contrary to Mr. Barth, reveals the following:

First: Remington was indicted first on June 8, 1950, on the count; namely, his denial of Communist Party membership. On February 7, 1951, he was convicted. Miss Bentley's testimony was believed by the jury. The fact that this conviction was reversed by the circuit court on the basis of error in the judge's charge to the jury in no way detracts from the veracity of Miss Bentley. Furthermore, this count is still outstanding.

Second: Remington was again indicted on October 25, 1951, on 5 counts, not 3 as Mr. Barth states, unless, of course, he was deliberately confusing the 2 indictments.

The five counts charged that Remington perjured himself—

First: When he denied that he had ever, to his knowledge, attended Communist Party meetings.

Second: When he denied that he had ever given Elizabeth Bentley or anyone else any classified information or any information to which they were not entitled for the purpose of having such information sent to Russia.

Third: When he denied that he had paid Communist Party dues.

Fourth: When he denied that he had ever asked anyone to join the Communist Party.

Fifth: When he denied that he had knowledge of the existence of the Young Communist League at Dartmouth College until his preparation for his defense in connection with his 1950 indictment. Remington attended Dartmouth College between 1934 and 1939.

Following his second trial, the jury returned the following verdict:

Count 1: No decision, the jury could not agree. This count is still pending. Thus Mr. Barth is wrong when he said the Government dropped the first count. Miss Bentley's testimony corroborated by other witnesses stands unchallenged.

Count 2: Guilty. Mr. Barth is again wrong as he said there was a hung jury on this count.

Count 3: No decision, the jury could not agree. This count is pending.

Count 4: Not guilty. This in no way detracts from Miss Bentley's credibility.

Count 5: Guilty.

Naturally, Mr. Barth could not be expected to admit he deliberately reported on the outcome of the Remington case falsely but the least he can say is that it resulted through inadvertence, in which case his respect for truth can be judged by whether he apologizes to Mr. Hoover and asks Harper's magazine to correct his inaccuracies.

In his Harper's article, after observing that the FBI makes loyalty investigations, he then states:

The questioning of accused employees in hearings under this program was based on information conveyed by the FBI confidential reports. Some exceedingly odd questions are asked. One Board member inquired, for instance, if an employee favored or opposed the segregation of blood in Red Cross blood banks.

Mr. Barth obviously means to infer that the FBI report contained some such information. But he should have

refreshed his recollection. In his book *The Loyalty of Free Men*—page 116, Cardinal editions—he clearly states that the Board member who asked the question was raising questions not in the interrogative which is based on the FBI report. Thus, any question of segregation of blood banks did not arise with the FBI. Ironically, he does not even take the Post's own editorial page seriously, or he conveniently forgot the letter to the editor published in the Post on May 2, 1951, from Harry W. Blair, who asked the question for which he would blame the FBI. In this letter, Mr. Blair specifically credits the Metropolitan Police department with producing the letter which served as the basis for the question Mr. Barth deplors.

Mr. Barth, in an effort to cast doubt on FBI reports, quotes from the debates on the confirmation of a United States Ambassador to Russia, a statement by an alleged informant who possessed a sixth sense and, without knowing how this statement was used in the FBI's summary, he then proceeds in a clever manner to convey the impression that this might be typical of the contents of FBI reports.

At the time, I made inquiry as to the significance of this statement. An agency, not the FBI, had hired this man who had given the Ambassador's name as a reference. Later, he was discharged as a homosexual. The records of the other agency reflect that the informant had learned to separate the "queer" from the men. He claimed he could spot them and has never made a mistake because he had a sixth sense. Contrary to Mr. Barth, when one claims he can spot a sex pervert by his walk and never make a mistake, it is of greatest importance to know how. If it is by a sixth sense, this at least is a cue to the reliability of the informant and an aid to those who must evaluate the reports. If Mr. Barth were really interested in fair play, as he would have us believe, he would have lauded the above statement which he now ridicules, because it aided the officials in evaluating that report which was admitted as derogatory and gave it the credence it deserved.

Up to this point, he has merely been laying the foundation for his chief evidence, which consists of several reports which are a matter of public record in the Federal courts in the Coplon case. Anyone who desires to do so can get these reports, and Mr. Barth certainly had access to them.

Mr. Barth errs when he says Miss Coplon had such delectable tidbits of information, which he enumerates, on her person when she was arrested. She did not. She had data slips on which was information of a substantive nature. These data slips are on file in court, and a matter of public record, but Mr. Barth would not have been able to smear the FBI had he stuck to the truth. The so-called frivolous material which Barth makes light of was not among the data slips.

In all, there were 34 such data slips. At least it can be concluded they were of sufficient importance for a spy to copy and endeavor to sneak to the Soviets, as Judy Coplon had them with her when

she was arrested. The reports quoted from by Barth were ordered produced by the Federal judge, since the data slips in Coplon's possession were made from these reports.

It seems that Mr. Barth is seeking to minimize Judith Coplon's damage to America, so he tries to discredit the FBI. The files he talks about were actually isolated reports of raw material. The file might contain scores of reports, and anyone who knows anything about security files knows that accusations are proven or disproven in subsequent reports.

Since he represents himself as an expert, his error in confusing files with reports and data slips would not ordinarily be charged to lack of knowledge. His article speaks for itself. Had he been really concerned and had he really wanted to present the truth—like any honest newsman—he would have sought out the facts.

Now, to analyze Barth's evidence:

First: Barth refers to "the statement of an unidentified informant that she had observed her neighbors 'moving around the house in a nude state' and that her 11-year-old boy said he saw one of these neighbors go out on the porch, undressed, to get the morning paper."

The actual report on file with the record in the Coplon case gives a full explanation. Contrary to Mr. Barth's statement, the informant's name and address appear in the report. He, not "she," as he said, went to the FBI because he was suspicious of his next-door neighbor. The neighbor worked at the State Department while his Russian-born wife worked at OSS. They had frequent gatherings at their home of high ranking Army and Navy officers. On occasions, great secrecy was maintained when once a month a foreign-appearing person called at the house. The informant very well could have been suspicious by the marked contrast in his neighbor's behavior, as, on other occasions when there was obviously no need for secrecy, the man and woman moved around the house in the nude and on one occasion the man went out to pick up the newspaper in the nude—defendants exhibit 113 A-6; transcript for June 10, 1949, morning session, pages 6051-6057. So what, Mr. Barth, does this prove, other than a meticulous effort of an FBI agent to report fully, information furnished him which goes into the raw file, by a man whose attention was directed to extreme secrecy on occasions while on others, in marked contrast, the inmates went around in the nude?

Second: Mr. Barth then seems to think FBI reports are of little value because "the files supplied the information that one of the assistants to the President of the United States had given some help in obtaining a passport for a trip to Mexico to a friend with whose wife, according to an informant, the Presidential aide had once been in love."

Mr. President, it is very distasteful for me to bring these matters to the floor of the Senate, and make the references I have had to make; but they are in reply to an article which appeared in one of the Nation's outstanding periodicals, Harper's magazine. Even though I ap-

proach this task with reluctance, my loyalty to the FBI and my desire to have the truth disclosed compel me to make reference to names and situations which I might otherwise not feel appropriate or proper.

The particular piece of information I was discussing was a lengthy report pertaining to Philip Levy, which clearly shows that his passport application was held up because of a possible involvement in a 1934 passport fraud concerning certain Communists, who have long records of involvement with Soviet espionage. The Presidential aid was David K. Niles, who wrote a letter to the State Department vouching for the Levys and pointing out he found it hard to believe that they would engage in un-American activities.

Obviously, it was important to find out what Niles' connection was with the Levys. Information was developed that Niles, in fact, was an old friend of the Levys and "fell in love" with Mrs. Levy prior to her marriage. Certainly, this old friendship was relevant to Niles' action, and I would think that Mr. Barth, if he truly were interested in fair play, would have commended the FBI rather than denounce it for supplying a motive for Niles' action. Were it not for this information, one reading a cold report would at once wonder if Niles was acting on behalf of persons who were suspect—defendant's exhibit 119; transcript for June 10, 1949, afternoon session, page 5504.

Third: Mr. Barth then questions a reference to Frederic March in a report, since he was neither an employee nor an applicant for a Government job. He, however, apparently does not question the propriety of the investigation of March, but merely the quality of the report.

Surely, the FBI must investigate allegations of Communist Party activity and affiliations. The information in this 8-page report, which was only one of several reports, is specific and pertinent to such an inquiry, although I hasten to add that it is my understanding that Mr. March, since the date of this report, has made his position clear and denies Communist Party membership or affiliation. The report, however, clearly shows there were other reports, and without all of them, neither Mr. Barth nor anyone else could give a full account of what happened. But, as could be expected, Mr. Barth elected to quote one of the most innocuous bits of information in the whole report—defendant's exhibit 106-A; transcript for June 8, 1948, pages 5235-5250. It is, indeed, regrettable that Mr. Barth should have injected Mr. March's name into the public forum at this late date and without making the full facts available in his Harper's magazine article.

In his article, he refers only to the reports in four cases. An examination shows that even in regard to these four cases, for which he must have searched long and hard, he has given an incomplete and distorted account. Is the FBI to be condemned on this basis alone? Certainly all officials of the Government were not blind to FBI reports—as is evidenced by the fact that, on the basis

of FBI reports, literally hundreds of unfit persons were ousted from Government jobs.

Surely Mr. Barth would not say that the FBI's record in World War II was the fault of bad reports, when, throughout the war, enemy espionage was held in check and the usual wartime sabotage did not occur.

Mr. Barth puts great stock in his argument by observing that Maj. Gen. William Donovan retained full confidence in an OSS officer, Duncan Lee, accused of espionage. But how can Barth honestly say Donovan retained Lee in the OSS with full confidence, after the FBI report? It is a matter of record that the FBI report went to the White House on November 8, 1945, while General Donovan left the OSS on October 1, 1945, a full month before the FBI even submitted the report.

At the very outset, Barth directed a heavy blow toward the FBI by quoting from a letter from the Under Secretary of War, Judge Robert P. Patterson, attesting to Silvermaster's suitability for Government service. What Mr. Barth did not say was that the letter was dated July 3, 1942, and Judge Patterson makes no reference to an FBI report. His letter did not clear Silvermaster on an FBI report; it was an Army report. Since Mr. Barth holds himself out as an expert on security, he must have seen part 3 of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report, dated April 16, 1953, on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments. On page 122 appears Silvermaster's memorandum dated June 9, 1942, wherein he specifically answers a document signed by Col. J. T. Bissell. Strangely, Mr. Barth is silent on Silvermaster's shameful performance in invoking the fifth amendment, the details of which are set forth in the April 16, 1953, report of the Internal Security Subcommittee, when, for example, Silvermaster—page 130—declined to answer whether he knew or had ever had conversation with Max Lowenthal.

Mr. President, after attempting to discredit FBI reports, Mr. Barth then turns his guns on the grand jury, and would make the reader believe he had clinched his point by pointing out that the grand jury failed to indict Harry Dexter White. He chides the Attorney General for stating "much of this evidence against him was received by wire tap," without making public the content of the intercepted conversations. Mr. Barth knows the answer, but it would not help his case to state that Federal law prohibits the divulgence of intercepted messages. Surely he is not so naive as to think he could bait the Attorney General into that trap. Likewise, Mr. Barth knows that subsequent to the appearance of White before the grand jury, the famed "pumpkin papers" became available, and they included handwritten messages from Harry Dexter White. But by that time, White's death had cheated the grand jury out of an indictment for perjury, if not for espionage.

Mr. Barth then moves to his favorite theme—the police state—which he defines in terms which do not exist. His deft use of words is reflected in his horror, not that the Truman administra-

tion was indifferent to Soviet espionage, but that the American public has become indifferent to a dangerous extension of police power.

What Mr. Barth seems to want is an abolition of all security measures and a cessation of exposure of Communist activities.

The truth of this matter is that high Government officials took no action on FBI reports because they did not see fit to, and not because of the contents of the reports. It is time to call a halt to alibis, and it is time to close the ranks, to the end that the American way of life can be preserved for Americans.

Mr. President, there is great danger in writing or saying anything not of a substantive nature about the FBI. Today the FBI stands as one of the great remaining bulwarks in this country against communism. In submitting these observations, I have merely tried to make the record crystal clear, because a magazine of the caliber of Harper's has chosen to publish an article containing half-truths, and it displays either a reluctance to use the whole truth, or a desire not to do so.

At the beginning of the last paragraph of the article, Mr. President, the author asks, "How good is an FBI report?" Because of the loose manner in which the name of the FBI is used in the article and because of the clear indication that the author either was not aware of the truth or was unwilling to develop it, I think the question which really should be asked is, How good is a story written by this author? In view of the article's glaring defects and departure from the facts, it is to be hoped that in the preparation of editorials for the Washington Post, this author will follow more closely the newsman's historic regard for the truth and nothing but the truth, including the full evidence available to him.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks, and I now yield the floor.

#### STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Assistant Parliamentarian proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, after hours, days, and months of debate, it may well be questioned if any new facts can be developed or if there is any information not heretofore made available to the Senate with reference to statehood for Hawaii.

However, as I have listened to the various speeches and as I have read the RECORD from day to day, I fail to find



any reference as to the readiness of the Territory of Hawaii for statehood based on the record made by the territorial legislature since Hawaii became an incorporated Territory of the United States.

Most of the Members of the United States Senate—a legislative body—have also served in their various State legislatures and have a very thorough understanding of the tremendous importance of the legislative branch not only of their National Government but of the States and Territories. Therefore, Mr. President, it seems pertinent that we should examine into the record, the character, the accomplishments of the legislative branch of the Hawaiian Territorial government in arriving at a decision pro or con on the question of statehood.

Under the provisions of the Northwest Ordinance, which has determined the form and structure of territorial governments, the legislative branch of Hawaii is almost identical with the legislative branch of the respective State governments. In each instance, the members are elected by the people, and procedures follow the traditional pattern of the American legislative system.

If the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii has functioned effectively, if it has promoted the well-being of the people of the Territory and has cooperated with Federal authorities in serving the best interests of the Nation, it follows beyond any reasonable doubt that the legislative branch of the new State government would serve the State and Nation well.

The Hawaiian Legislature was established 54 years ago by an act of Congress which made Hawaii an incorporated Territory. It has held 27 regular biennial sessions and a number of special sessions. Its membership of 15 senators, elected for 4-year terms, and 30 representatives, elected for 2-year terms, has functioned on the same basis as the Territorial legislature of each of the 29 States heretofore admitted.

The most significant fact about the Legislature of Hawaii is that a higher percentage of the registered voters have actually participated in the election of members than has been the case in any of the other Territories. I think it is a significant fact that throughout the years, on the average, 91 percent of the eligible voters of Hawaii have gone to the polls and cast their ballots. I think that contrasts most favorably with the fact that in the United States the average percentage throughout all the years, for all the States, is approximately only 50.

The Legislature of Hawaii has operated under the same limitations as other Territorial legislatures. The organic act adopted in 1900 provided that the Congress might veto any act that was looked upon as being unwise or detrimental to the community or to the Nation. It is a matter of record that during 54 years that Hawaii has been a Territory, Congress has never exercised this power.

The laws enacted have contributed to the social, political, and economic growth of the Territory. It is significant that all during the period leading up to World War II and during the trying years of

that war the Legislature of Hawaii cooperated with the armed services and with other agencies of the Nation in carrying out defense plans and in the actual prosecution of the war. It is because of this prompt cooperation that a considerable number of the military leaders of the Pacific area during World War II are on record as favoring statehood for Hawaii.

I read from an article published in the Honolulu Advertiser of September 3, 1945:

ARMY HEADQUARTERS, MIDDLE PACIFIC, FORT SHAFTER, T. H.—Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., commanding Army forces in the middle Pacific, today thanked the people of the Territory of Hawaii for their part in the war, in the following statement:

"This is an appropriate time to express admiration of, and gratitude for, the manner in which the people of the Territory of Hawaii have supported the Army during the war.

"Military necessity required the imposition on the Territory of restrictions, such as the curfew and censorship of civilian communications, that the people of the mainland were not called upon to undergo. These restrictions, as well as the general civilian hardships of war, were accepted in a splendid spirit of cooperation.

"For many months Hawaii was America's last outpost in the Pacific, its people under constant threat of attack as fierce as the onslaught which opened the war on December 7, 1941. Yet the people never faltered. Patiently, courageously, they went about their tasks, supporting the Armed Forces by every means in their power—doing war-production work, buying war bonds, donating blood, providing comforts for those in service.

"Even more, they gave their sons and daughters to the services, in which enviable records were established. In many homes today the joy that peace has come is saddened by the memory that a son or brother will not return, because he paid the full price of freedom on some Pacific island or European hilltop.

"I am therefore very deeply grateful to the people of Hawaii for their unfailing support of the Army and of me as their commander in the discharge of my responsibilities. It is both a duty and a pleasure to make public acknowledgment of the gratitude which I feel."

I should like to read, also, the statement made by Maj. Gen. Charles D. Herron:

I was in command in Hawaii from 1937 to 1941, shortly before Pearl Harbor, when I was retired for age. \* \* \* The people of Hawaii are not only good people but they have long since shown themselves to be wise and fully worthy of full citizenship. It should not be possible for anyone to campaign in the halls of the Interior Department and to be appointed their governor.

In March 1947 the then Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, testified, as follows:

General MacArthur is striving diligently and, I think, intelligently, to establish democracy in Japan and in Okinawa. He told me that the establishment and expansion of our democracy and our system of government to the areas that are held by the United States would aid him greatly to that end; that it would be a definite action, putting American democratic principles into effect; and he was very strong in his views as to statehood for Hawaii. \* \* \* I talked to, I think, every military leader in the Pacific, and I heard not one single word that our military security would be impaired by Hawaiian statehood.

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz testified:

I have given close study to the islands from a military and naval aspect. I perceive no objection from a military or naval standpoint to the Hawaiian Islands achieving statehood. \* \* \* I had an opportunity to observe the people of the Hawaiian Islands, and I have a great admiration and appreciation of the complete and wholehearted cooperation they gave to the war effort. \* \* \* Hawaii occupies a most important geographical position in the Pacific. Whether it is a Territory or a State, it would still be our main base in the Pacific.

Former Chief of Staff, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, has said:

The splendid part played by Hawaii in the Korean war is entirely in keeping with the distinguished record it established in World War II.

The splendid part played by Hawaii in the Korean War is entirely in keeping with the distinguished record it established in World War II.

In peace and in war, Hawaii's legislature demonstrated its capacity to govern wisely, effectively, and efficiently.

As an indication of this capacity, I wish to review a limited number of fields in which the legislative program of Hawaii has been especially effective and sound.

First, I wish to speak about its support of education.

Hawaii's public-school system was established in 1840 under the leadership of teachers from New England. The legislative branch of government first under the constitutional monarchy, then under the Republic of Hawaii and finally under the Territory has given constructive leadership and liberal financial support to the school program. As a result the school system is recognized as being one of the soundest and most progressive in the entire world.

As a result of legislation the control of schools in Hawaii is more highly centralized than in any State in the Union. This has resulted in a higher degree of quality of educational opportunity for all the children than is generally found. For instance, there is one salary schedule for all teachers regardless of whether they work in city schools or in rural schools; education requirements are the same for teachers in all localities; the same educational supply and equipment items are provided for each school; school systems have been consolidated with the result that practically all small schools have been eliminated, thus giving the better educational advantages that are offered by larger schools.

Of even greater significance is the fact that the legislative branch has provided adequate financial support. For example, a report of the National Education Association for the school year 1952-53 shows that the average annual salary for the instructional staff in the United States was \$3,530. Hawaii's average annual salary for that school year was \$3,669, which means that the average school teacher in Hawaii received \$139 more in salary each year than did a teacher in the United States. Only 14 States paid higher salaries and 34 paid lower salaries. I regret to say that my State is among those that pay lower salaries than are paid in Hawaii.

Liberal support has also been given to other phases of the educational program, such as educational supplies and equipment and to the public school building program, although in Hawaii as in most of the mainland States there is an urgent need for additional school buildings.

The legislature has also authorized sabbatical leave for teachers with part pay, a single salary schedule for teachers which recognizes that the work of teachers in the lower grades is just as valuable as the contribution of teachers on the secondary school level, and a retirement system that is rated as among the best in the Nation.

Mr. President, regardless of what may be said of the economic control being exercised over Hawaii by the so-called Big Five, I can definitely state that the Big Five corporations are very generous in their taxation policy toward public schools.

Liberal provisions have also been made for the University of Hawaii, a land-grant institution with an enrollment of approximately 6,000 students.

Liberal support has also been provided for an adult education program and for a system of free libraries established throughout the Territory.

Second, let us consider the situation with reference to public health.

The Territory has an enviable health record. The death rate is substantially below the national average. The infant mortality is one of the lowest in the Nation. A general hospital support program is regularly maintained. The people of the Territory are proud of the free hospitalization which it provides for all patients suffering from tuberculosis. Free chest X-rays are provided.

The Hawaiian Legislature has always been forward looking in providing funds for this purpose.

For almost a hundred years the Territory has had an internationally recognized program for the care of the victims of Hansen's disease—leprosy—and its treatment. Until last year the cost of this program had been carried entirely by legislative appropriations. The United States Public Health Service now shares in the cost.

Third, labor relations: Hawaii early showed its concern with relation to the welfare of the workman. It was one of the first to adopt a workman's compensation act. Few sessions have passed where the benefits have not been reviewed and increased to the point where these benefits equal or exceed those of almost every State. Unemployment compensation is provided. A wage-and-hour law regulates the wages and hours of workers including children. The department of labor has been established to enforce certain laws and to protect the workman. A little Wagner Act guarantees the right of labor to organize. It is one of the few laws of the Nation to guarantee this right to agricultural labor.

Fourth, Public service: Legislation with respect to public employees is modern. Civil Service and classification systems have been established by law. A contributory retirement system on a sound actuarial basis has been in effect for nearly 30 years.

Fifth, General welfare: The legislature has been ready to repel any attack on the peace, happiness, and welfare of its people. It has been alert to the dangers of subversives. A loyalty oath program has been established and covers all government employees. Refusal to testify before a public board, agency, or commission on the ground of privilege against self-incrimination automatically removes the employee and disqualifies him from holding public office or public employment.

A loyalty board as well as a subversive activities commission was created. The legislature has not hesitated to request by resolution the investigation of communism and subversive activities in Hawaii by the Congress. In 1949 it requested the House Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct an investigation in Hawaii. The investigation was made in 1950. A formal report to Congress was made in 1951. This report in part states:

The evidence shows that as of 1951 the people of Hawaii have successfully cast communistic influences out of all phases of their political, social, cultural, and educational activities.

The important consideration here is that the study was made at the request of the legislature.

The proposed constitution for Hawaii reflects the concern of the elected representatives of the people in relation to communism. Article XIV, section 3, provides:

No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

In 1941 a Hawaii Defense Act, since then further perfected and refined, grants emergency powers to the Governor during M-day conditions.

On convening in 1949, because of the interruptions to commerce from the long continued waterfront strike, the legislature promptly evolved legislation enabling the Territory to seize and conduct waterfront operations for the protection of the health and welfare of the people. The problem was squarely and promptly met, although there were no extensive precedents or guides in legislation of other jurisdictions.

Progressive legislation in other fields is to be found in the statutes of the Territory. Throughout there is evidenced a real desire to promote the health, welfare, and happiness of all of the people and a desire to consider and adopt desirable legislation that Hawaii may be a truly American community.

On the basis of the record there is ample evidence that when Hawaii becomes a State the legislative branch of its government will serve the community and the Nation well.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. HUNT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. First, Mr. President, I should like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Wyoming on his

very excellent analysis of the governmental and economic progress made in the Territory of Hawaii. I think the Senator has presented in rather brief form one of the best speeches in favor of long-deserved statehood for Hawaii I have ever heard. The Senator is a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, and, as such, I know, has long been interested in the great strategic and military value of Hawaii to the United States, and, as he has indicated in his speech, he is conversant with the excellent record made by the citizens of Hawaii and the fine part they played in defense of the country in the last World War.

Does not the Senator think that, from the military viewpoint, looking at the military security of the United States, there are many advantages to be gained by this Nation from granting statehood to Hawaii?

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his kindly remarks with reference to the paper which I have just read, and I would say that, looking upon the question from a personal standpoint, if I were simply a citizen of a Territory I do not believe I would have, perhaps, the great love of country, the patriotism, the great desire to fight for the Nation, that I would have if I were the citizen of a State in the sisterhood of States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that, from the standpoint of military installations and the strategic position of Hawaii in connection with the defense of the Nation, could those essential factors be better recognized if Hawaii were granted full representation as a State, with Members in the Senate and the House of Representatives?

Mr. HUNT. I think that statement is very factual. The distinguished Senator, who serves with me on the Armed Services Committee, knows very well that military housing and other factors incident to fortifying Alaska—and the same statement applies to Hawaii—if not retarded, at least were made more difficult because the two Territories do not have a voice on any committee in the Congress. My interest in the legislative branch of the Hawaiian government is prompted by a visit I made to the islands in 1947 in company with the present Chief Justice of the United States, then the Governor of California, Earl Warren. I marveled at the orderly manner in which proceedings were conducted in the Legislature of Hawaii.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to join in congratulating the able Senator from Wyoming on his very clear and concise statement. Of course, as he knows, I do not agree with his conclusions, but I recognize a good statement when I hear one, and so I extend my congratulations.

I should like to ask one question. The Senator from Wyoming referred to the fact that the Un-American Activities Committee had visited the Territory of Hawaii and reported in 1951 that they thought the people of Hawaii had eliminated the Communist menace at that



time. I wonder whether the Senator is familiar with the report which was filed by the Subversive Activities Commission of the Territory of Hawaii, the one which was financed by the Territorial government and which is cited on page 156 of the hearings, which shows that the ILWU completely controls the economic and political life of the Territory of Hawaii and that it is completely Communist dominated at the moment. Is the Senator at all acquainted with that statement?

Mr. HUNT. I did not read that statement. I felt thoroughly convinced by the quotation which I found in the report of the House committee in 1951, which stated:

The evidence shows that as of 1951 the people of Hawaii have successfully cast communist influence out of all phases of their political, social, cultural, and educational activities.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that the first substantial opposition in the Senate to statehood for Hawaii was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], on the ground that there was some Communist influence in Hawaii; and that now the Senator from Nebraska, who is a very careful observer of influences of this kind is satisfied that communism has been eliminated and that there is no reason to hold up statehood for Hawaii any longer on the theory that there may be some Communist influence in Hawaii?

Mr. HUNT. The Senator from Tennessee is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Wyoming recognizes, does he not, that Delegate FARRINGTON probably is an expert on the question of the Communist situation in Hawaii?

Mr. HUNT. I think he should be a very good authority.

Mr. SMATHERS. In answer to a question asked of him in the committee, Delegate FARRINGTON made a statement, which is contained in the hearings that Communist influence was strong in the Territory of Hawaii. In answer to a question propounded by me as to whether or not Communist influence had much to do with the result of the elections, Delegate FARRINGTON said there was no doubt about it.

Mr. HUNT. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida with reference to the particular date when he was discussing the question?

Mr. SMATHERS. I was discussing it when the testimony took place before the committee, which was last year—1953—and Delegate FARRINGTON was testifying, I presume, with reference to that year.

Mr. HUNT. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if it was the Delegate to Congress or a former governor who made that statement?

Mr. SMATHERS. It was the Delegate to Congress, Hon. JOSEPH FARRING-

TON. As a matter of fact, as the Senator from Wyoming knows, former Governor Stainback, who heretofore had been a staunch advocate of statehood for Hawaii, recently returned and stated that he did not believe this was an opportune time to admit the Territory of Hawaii as a State because of the Communist influence now prevailing in the Territory.

Mr. HUNT. While I am not at all taking a position contrary to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Florida, I am wondering if there ever has been any type of shipping and dock strike controlled by the Communists in Hawaii comparable to that which is now in progress in the city of New York.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to answer the question. There was a strike in Hawaii of such long duration that it finally was necessary to resort to calling out the militia.

Then, after the seven Communists were convicted in Hawaii 2 years ago, there was a political strike, in which there was involved no issue of wages, hours, or working conditions; but 26,000 workers simply walked off their jobs merely in protest of the conviction of John Hall and his associates as Communists.

So the Hawaiians have had their troubles, and the unfortunate fact is that the ILWU is the only big union in Hawaii. It is unlike New York, where there are other unions and other enterprises operating. When the union in Hawaii stops work, everything comes to a halt.

Mr. HUNT. Does the distinguished Senator from Florida contend that conditions on the docks in Hawaii are any worse than they are in the United States today?

Mr. SMATHERS. It is my humble opinion that John Hall and Harry Bridges have tighter control over the ILWU on the west coast of the United States and in the Territory of Hawaii than they do on the east coast. The CIO threw the ILWU on the east coast out because it was Communist dominated. The struggle going on in New York today concerns who is going to win control of the longshoremen in New York, the ILWU, a union which is Communist controlled and dominated, or the new union.

Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the Senator from Wyoming on his fair statement.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wyoming has just made a very able statement in regard to the stability of the Territory of Hawaii from a governmental and an economic standpoint. I was especially interested in that phase of his remarks in which he discussed the legislative branch of the Territory, which I think is most important.

I do not believe the record of the debates in the Senate on the important issue of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska should be completed without placing in the RECORD resolutions which were approved by the governors' con-

ference for a number of years on this important issue.

It was my privilege to serve as Governor of Kansas during the years 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], who has just finished speaking, was a member of the governors' conference from the great State of Wyoming during the years 1947 and 1948, he having been elected to the United States Senate in 1948. I am certain the Senator from Wyoming will agree with me that this question was on the agenda for discussion at every one of the conferences.

It was my privilege to serve as a member of the resolutions committee in 1947 and in 1948, as chairman of the resolutions committee in 1949, and as chairman of the governors' conference in 1950. I well remember that the recognized officials of the Territory of Hawaii and the Territory of Alaska came before our committee and presented their cases for statehood. For the RECORD, I wish to submit the various resolutions, for instance, the resolution adopted by the governors' conference at the 39th annual meeting, held in Salt Lake City, Utah, July 13 to 16, 1947. I desire to have the RECORD show the statements in regard to statehood for Hawaii and statehood for Alaska. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all these resolutions, but I think it would be of interest to read 1 or 2 of them.

The following resolution was adopted in 1947:

#### STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The people of Hawaii have at the ballot box expressed their desire to achieve statehood. Hawaii is one of the two incorporated Territories of the United States for which statehood, following American tradition and precedent, is clearly indicated as their destiny. Hawaii has been under the American flag for 49 years and has therefore undergone a period of preparation and tutelage far longer than that of most Territories before they achieved statehood. The expressed wish of our own fellow citizens of Hawaii is merely for the fulfillment of the moderate, understandable, traditional, and legitimate aspiration to achieve full equality and responsibility in the family of States and for self-government according to the established American pattern.

Therefore the governors' conference hereby expresses its sympathy with the recorded desire for statehood for the people of Hawaii and endorses the passage of suitable legislation by the Congress to achieve that end.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Am I correct in my understanding that the Governors' Conference never adopts a resolution except by a unanimous vote?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Oregon is correct. No action ever is taken at a governors' conference when there is one objection to a resolution.

In the same year, 1947, the Governors' Conference also adopted the following resolution:

#### STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The people of Alaska have at the ballot box expressed their desire to achieve statehood. Alaska is one of the two incorporated Territories of the United States for which statehood, following American tradition and precedent, is clearly indicated as their des-

tiny. Alaska has been under the American flag for 80 years and has therefore undergone a period of preparation and tutelage far longer than that of most Territories before they achieved statehood. The expressed wish of our own fellow citizens of Alaska is merely for the fulfillment of the moderate, understandable, traditional, and legitimate aspiration to achieve full equality and responsibility in the family of States and for self-government according to the established American pattern.

Therefore the Governors' Conference hereby expresses its sympathy with the recorded desire for statehood of the people of Alaska, and endorses the passage of suitable legislation by the Congress to achieve that end.

Mr. President, at the 40th annual meeting of the governors' conference at Portsmouth, N. H., on June 13 to 16, 1948, the governors' conference again adopted a resolution favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The governors' conference hereby reiterates its sympathy with the recorded desire for statehood of the people of Alaska and Hawaii, and endorses the passage of suitable legislation by the Congress to achieve that end.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator remember that during the conferences of governors the resolutions were not adopted with the rapidity of lightning, but were very carefully analyzed and very thoroughly studied, the governors knowing full well that resolutions must be unanimously approved by representatives from all the States before they were adopted?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Wyoming is absolutely correct. I am sure he remembers instances when resolutions were not adopted because there was not unanimous approval of them.

Mr. HUNT. The resolutions were not adopted unless unanimously approved.

Mr. CARLSON. I was interested in statements made some time ago on the floor of the Senate about Governor Stainback, who appeared before our committee each one of the 4 years I was a member of the Committee on Resolutions, and urged statehood for Hawaii. He now comes before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and opposes statehood for Hawaii. I can hardly understand the reason why that change in his attitude could have developed except that, as I understand, he is now sitting as a judge. Perhaps that makes some difference.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas one further question. In our discussions in the conference of governors with reference to the question of statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska, does the Senator not remember that as the conference reiterated its resolutions year after year, it was done only after complete hearings each year?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Wyoming is absolutely correct. They were not canned resolutions; they were new resolutions each year, and their adoption was urged at the conference of governors.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to remind the distinguished Senator from Kansas that when hearings were held on Alaskan statehood in 1949, two of the witnesses who appeared at that time were Governor Driscoll of New Jersey and then Governor Warren, of California. I make that statement merely because some persons have stated that there has been, politically, one-sided support of the proposal for statehood, when that is not true. Governor Warren came across the country at his own expense, and testified forcefully and very intelligently on behalf of statehood for Alaska at that time. Certainly the intervening years, during which there has been a substantial growth in population, have justified the optimism he then had.

I wanted the acting majority leader [Mr. CARLSON] to give full credit to the fact that those two Republican governors came to that hearing in 1949 and spoke strongly not only in favor of Hawaiian statehood, but also in behalf of Alaskan statehood, both of which they favored. In my opinion, Governor Warren's statement was one of the finest delivered on the whole subject.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct. There was absolutely no partisanship in the actions taken at the Governor's Conference. An objection on the part of one of the 48 governors will prevent a resolution from being reported from the resolutions committee or adopted by the governor's conference. Several past governors of States are Members of the Senate, and they will remember that normally the members of the conference are pretty well divided among the States of the Union, so far as concerns the number of governors elected on the Democratic and Republican tickets. There was certainly no partisanship reflected in the action on the resolutions considered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Kansas has suggested that possibly the fact that Governor Stainback has now acquired the status of Judge of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, may be the reason why he has changed his mind. I am sure the Senator would not want to infer that Justice Stainback has changed his opinion because of other than the most worthy of motives.

Mr. CARLSON. I was merely surprised at the change in the stand Governor Stainback had taken for 4 years while I was on the resolutions committee or chairman of the governor's conference. During that period he earnestly pleaded for statehood for Hawaii, and then in a year's time he changed his mind.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator would agree, would he not, that in view of the fact that Governor Stainback spent 42 years in Hawaii, he would be in a position to know what was going on in Hawaii?

Mr. CARLSON. I would fail to be frank if I should say I did not think he would be in a position to know. Following Governor Stainback, a Kansan, Governor Long, was selected as Governor of Hawaii. I have had visits with him, and I am somewhat familiar with his knowledge of the islands. He has been on the islands 37 years.

Mr. SMATHERS. I assume the Senator from Kansas is not going to say that we accepted Justice Stainback's remarks when he was on our side, but that we should not accept his opinion when he came back later and stated, as he did as the Senator will find if he cares to look at the record, that after reviewing the matter, in view of the fact that Communists had not been eliminated, as he hoped they would be, he could now best serve the interests of the United States by telling the people of America that this is not the opportune time to admit Hawaii as a State. Merely because the Senator from Kansas disagrees with Justice Stainback, I am sure the Senator does not wish to impute improper motives to him.

Mr. CARLSON. The junior Senator from Kansas does not wish to impute improper motives to Justice Stainback, but the Senator remembers how energetic Governor Stainback was in urging statehood for Hawaii at the governors' conference each time I happened to be a member of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, referring to Governor Stainback's position, the Senator from Kansas would not care to have the inference drawn, would he, that he lacks belief in the power of education? Here is a man who after long familiarity and consideration of the question of statehood, has now changed his views. Is that not a normal thing for people to do after they have learned thoroughly about a subject?

Mr. CARLSON. It may be very normal, but after having been a member of the Resolutions Committee of the governors' conference, and having served as Governor of Kansas for 4 years, the Senator from Kansas thinks it is interesting that Governor Stainback changed his mind so rapidly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Governor Stainback did not do it rapidly; it took 40 years. One ought to give more credit to his views, because Governor Stainback has studied the question for a long time.

Mr. CARLSON. Again I wish to say that for a period of 4 years at the end of his 40 years, Governor Stainback had urged statehood, and then all of a sudden he changed his mind. It may be that it was due to education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has not the Senator from Kansas noticed that Senators who have become Members of the Senate with one set of views have changed



them after becoming familiar in the Senate with practices, procedures, and knowledge of the Government?

Mr. CARLSON. I have noticed that Senators grow more conservative as they continue their service in the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I cannot let the discussion about Governor Stainback pass without saying a word. Governor Stainback originally came from my State of Tennessee. Many relatives of his still live there. I have known Governor Stainback for some time. Although I disagree with his present attitude about statehood for Hawaii, I think we would be doing him a grave injustice if we impugned his motives or honesty in reaching the conclusions he has reached. He may not have the proper facts as a basis for his opinion, but I know that Governor Stainback is an honorable man.

The other point I wished to make was that I heard it said that the present Governor of Hawaii, the Governor who succeeded Governor Stainback, was from the State of Kansas. I have met Mr. Long. It is my definite impression that he, too, came from the State of Tennessee, and lived at Knoxville. I wondered how the Senator got him all the way out to Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The comment of the Senator from Tennessee is most interesting. Governor Long is very highly regarded as a distinguished Kansan. He has been in my office, and we have had many conversations about his early life in Kansas.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the Senator from Kansas would not mind sharing Governor Long with the State of Tennessee, because he used the extremely good wisdom of residing for a considerable part of his life in the Volunteer State.

Mr. CARLSON. Not only are we glad to share him, but we are very proud of him and of his service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the resolutions adopted by the governors' conference at its 41st annual meeting at Colorado Springs, Colo., on June 19-22, 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the resolutions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Excerpt from resolutions adopted by the governors' conference, 41st annual meeting, Colorado Springs, Colo., June 19-22, 1949]

#### X. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The governors' conference urges the Congress promptly to enact enabling legislation to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 42d annual meeting of the governors' conference was held at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on June 18 to 21, 1950. At that time it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the conference. I now ask unanimous consent that the resolution regarding statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, as adopted by that conference, be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Excerpt from resolutions adopted by the governors' conference, 42d annual meeting, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., June 18-21, 1950]

#### V. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The governors' conference for the fourth successive time urges the Congress to enact legislation to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

As we meet in mid-June, 1950, statehood bills for both our incorporated Territories have passed the House of Representatives, and extensive hearings have been held by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We strongly urge this committee to report these bills promptly, so that the Senate may pass on this important issue.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 43d annual meeting of the governors' conference was held at Gatlinburg, Tenn., on September 30-October 3, 1951, following my election to the United States Senate. I notice that the conference again adopted a resolution in regard for statehood for Hawaii and statehood for Alaska. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Excerpt from resolutions adopted by the governors' conference, 43d annual meeting, Gatlinburg, Tenn., September 30-October 3, 1951]

#### VII. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The last four meetings of the governors' conference have recommended passage of statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska. The governors' conference again urges prompt action by the Congress to permit these two Territories to achieve statehood.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask my distinguished friend and colleague from the State to the north of my home State whether during those governors' conferences—in connection with which I recognize the able leadership of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kansas, at the time when he was Governor of the State of Kansas—any discussion was had in regard to another status which might be desirable both for the United States and for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

I realize that the governors, believing thoroughly in the necessity for local self-government, would have an impelling desire to make sure that no sections would be left without the privilege of self-government. Therefore, I wonder whether at any of the conferences there was a discussion of any other status, such as commonwealth status, which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and I are suggesting as an alternative to the plan for full statehood, which seems to have been the issue largely before the country, for the people have generally understood that the ques-

tion was either statehood or being condemned to the inferior status of a Territory, with appointive chief executives, and so forth, a system which is distasteful to the people generally, as well as to the representatives of such groups as the governors' conference.

Mr. CARLSON. Let me say that for the 4 years during which I happened to be a member of the governors' conference—serving 2 years as a member of the resolutions committee, 1 year as chairman of that committee, and 1 year as chairman of the entire conference—at no time was it proposed to the conference that these Territories have any status other than that of statehood. I assume that it was natural for the governors to take that position.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, the issue at that time was either statehood or a Territorial status; is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for having contributed so ably, as he always does, to the thorough discussion of these very important issues.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, the 44th annual meeting of the governors' conference was held at Houston, Tex., from June 29 to July 2, 1952. I wish to read the resolution regarding statehood for Hawaii and Alaska which was adopted at that time:

#### II. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The 44th governors' conference for the 6th successive time renews its recommendation that the Congress promptly enact statehood legislation for our two incorporated Territories, Alaska and Hawaii. They have been kept under a Territorial status for 68 and 52 years respectively. The governors' conference believes that their long period of tutelage should be ended and that they should be granted equality under the established formula which validates our American principle of government by consent of the governed.

Mr. President, I believe it is most important that those resolutions, dealing with statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, be made a part of the debate on this subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to speak very briefly on the Hawaii-Alaska statehood issue.

First, I wish to comment very good naturedly on what I thought was a most interesting exchange, a few minutes ago, between the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], regarding the observations of each as to what happens to the thinking of Members of the Senate.

I was particularly delighted with the observation of the Senator from Kansas that the longer most Senators serve in the Senate, the more conservative they become. I wish to say that I appreciate that observation, and it is one reason for my becoming an Independent in the Senate. I too have noticed that the longer they stay here the more inclined Senators are to become very conservative. Apparently party discipline and partisan expediency has that influence on some men. Liberals on the other hand maintain an independence of judg-

ment on the merits of issues free of party discipline.

In discussing the subject before the Senate, I desire to say that for sometime past we have listened, off and on, to a debate on the question of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. I believe it is fair for me to conclude that, in the course of the debate, we have about covered the subject matter.

Thus, today I have notified the leadership of the Senate that I shall be very happy to cooperate with them in obtaining an agreement calling for termination of the debate. Although it will be very inconvenient for me, personally, to have such an agreement entered this week, nevertheless, I think the best interests of the Senate and of the legislative program confronting the Senate during the remainder of the session call for at least an attempt to bring debate on this issue to an end this week, unless there are some Senators who really believe they have much more to offer regarding the merits of the issue. Of course, if there are such Senators, I certainly would not wish debate to end.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In looking around the Senate Chamber and noticing the attendance of Senators at this time, I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon is telling us that at this time the Senate is giving adequate attention to this very important problem.

Mr. MORSE. I have reached the conclusion that the Senate has already given adequate attention to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When did that occur?

Mr. MORSE. As I have said, in days and weeks gone by, I believe adequate attention was given to this issue during the course of debate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oregon knows, I assume, that there are only about six Senators on the floor at this time; and all of them have taken part in the debate on this issue, and probably have made up their minds about it, although it is fair to assume that all the other Members of the Senate have not adequately considered the pending issue.

Mr. MORSE. At the moment I notice nine Senators in attendance, which is a fairly good attendance these days.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Oregon really believe that is a good attendance of Senators?

Mr. MORSE. In view of past experience, I believe that is a remarkably good attendance of Senators. Of course it should be pointed out that there are probably 50 Senators sitting in committee meetings at this very moment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oregon knows that the Senate has not given thorough consideration to the pending issue, in the sense that not all Senators have listened to the debate and know what the details of the pending issue are.

Mr. MORSE. In rebuttal of my colleague's observation, I wish to say that I think most Senators read much better than they listen. I believe that undoubtedly our colleagues have read much

of the rather lengthy debate on the statehood issue, which has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How does the Senator know they have read it?

Mr. MORSE. I know it from conversations with my colleagues. I am quite surprised, I will say to my friend from Arkansas, how frequently they show that they have read the reports of the Independent Party. I am always honored if as many as nine Senators are present to listen to a report of the Independent Party. I notice that many Senators read such reports.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that anywhere near a majority of Senators have either read or listened to the debate upon the proposal for commonwealth status for these two Territories?

Mr. MORSE. All fun aside, I am satisfied in my own mind that an overwhelming majority of our colleagues in the Senate are familiar with the commonwealth proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Arkansas, that they have given careful consideration to the merits and demerits of it, that they have reached a conclusion as to their position on it, and are ready to vote. Only because I believe that is the case would I make any exception to the general policy which I announced earlier this year, of not entering into unanimous-consent agreements to vote on specific dates.

Mr. President, my speech this afternoon will be limited to the reading of a letter which I have received from a businessman in the islands, a former Oregonian, a man whom I know very well. He is a good student of world problems, as well as of our national problems. I can testify here today that he is a man who enjoys a very fine reputation in the islands. I knew him when, years ago, he was a student at the University of Oregon. His name is Buchwach. He writes to me under date of March 17. I shall read the letter and make a few comments on it, and that will comprise my speech. The letter reads as follows:

MARCH 17, 1954.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
United States Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Honolulu papers yesterday published reports from Washington about your aim to force completion of debate and a vote on the statehood bill. It was a shot in the arm for the people of Hawaii, who during the past week have been down in the dumps because they fear that once more they're going to be deserted stepchildren.

Hawaii preferred that both she and Alaska be considered on their merits and voted on separately as to qualifications for entering the Union. Now that they are wedded, however, the political considerations affecting each Territory should be eliminated and a vote on the merits possible.

It seems no more than simple justice to us that the United States Senate be permitted to vote "yes" or "no" on the statehood question. To be kept from our rightful place among the family of States by the undemocratic and unfair tactics of a vociferous minority, that is hard to take.

The most bitter medicine is the charge that we are completely controlled by Communists and would be a "Communist state." That is false testimony. It is the Commu-

nists most of all who don't want Hawaii to be a state, and for good reason. Day by day the Reds are pouring out propaganda in the Far East, denouncing the United States as an imperialist power, a nation that preaches democracy and treats all non-Caucasians as second-class citizens. The Communists encounter difficulty when they try to explain Hawaii, where there is tolerance and understanding and good will and the color of skin is as unimportant as the color of a man's hair.

But the Communists, fortunately for them, are provided with ammunition that strikes right to the target among the minds of millions of non-Caucasians in the Far East. That ammunition is that the United States refuses to let Hawaii be admitted to the Union, not because she is not fully qualified, not because her citizens have not demonstrated their patriotism and Americanism, but because of the many Americans who are non-Caucasian.

If Hawaii were admitted to the Union, the Communists would reel under the impact of a psychological blow whose importance cannot be overestimated. Their lies and their charges against the United States would be blown to bits, and Hawaii would be a symbol of democracy and hope for millions of little people of the Far East to whom action speaks far more loudly than words.

No, the Communists don't want Hawaii to be a State. That would rob them of a powerful weapon.

As for communism in Hawaii, it feeds on unfertile soil. It is true that we have Communists, and that using labor unions as a mask they have managed to achieve some influence. It is not true they control the people of Hawaii; it is not true they would have control over whom we would send to the United States Senate.

Communism breeds best and most where there is racial discrimination; where poverty is widespread; where misery and hate are abundant; where life is a daily burden.

It does not breed best where there is no racial discrimination; where the living standard is among the highest in the world; where there is sunshine and happiness that out here is called Aloha.

Communism cannot succeed in a land where Americanism and democracy are not merely words in political speeches but a pattern of everyday living. To fear that Communists could take over Hawaii is to fear the Devil could overpower God.

Those who try to deny the good Americans of Hawaii statehood on the flimsy pretense of Communist domination are bearing false witness against their neighbors.

That is why you, Senator Morse, and every Senator who has had the courage and honesty to stand up in the Halls of Congress and defend us—who have no Senators of our own to do so—carry with you the blessings of the people of Hawaii, and I assure you, are truly good Americans.

Very sincerely yours,

BUCK BUCHWACH.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator from Oregon agree with me that it is very difficult to understand the alleged fear and the faulty conclusion that if Hawaii should become a State, whoever would come to the United States Senate would be dominated by Communists? The people of Hawaii have sent representatives to Congress for many years. Communists have not dominated them. I cannot see why coming as a Senator would be any different than coming as a Delegate. There are free elections in Hawaii. I do not see how a Senator



would be in any different status in that respect than the present Delegate, Mr. FARRINGTON, who was elected in a free election. When I first went to the House of Representatives the distinguished Samuel King was the Delegate. He was elected as the result of a free election. If the representatives were designated as Senators instead of Delegates, what would be the difference in Hawaii? I cannot see that there would be any.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot, either. I think the Senator has answered the question by pointing out that the present Delegate, Mr. FARRINGTON, was elected in a free election. I do not know of anyone who might be more anti-Communist than Delegate FARRINGTON.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or Samuel King.

Mr. MORSE. Or Samuel King.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. In the letter which the Senator read it is stated that the Communists do not want statehood for Hawaii. I wonder if the Senator is familiar with the statement made by Jack Hall, who was one of those convicted of being a Communist, in a speech which he delivered on Labor Day, 1951, when he said, in front of the courthouse:

Don't forget we are aching for statehood, and then we will be able to elect our Governor and our judges and we will have control of the police.

That statement was made by Jack Hall, the leader of the ILWU, an admitted Communist union.

Mr. MORSE. I am familiar with the statement. I agree with the implications of Mr. Buchwach's argument; namely, that irrespective of what they say, the big-lie technique being the motif of their public relations, the Communists are hoping that Hawaii does not get statehood, because they can cause a great deal more trouble in the Pacific if Hawaii is not a State than they could if Hawaii were a State. I think Mr. Buchwach is absolutely correct when he says that the granting of statehood to Hawaii would be one of the most effective blows against communism in Hawaii that we could possibly deliver in the Senate by our votes on this issue.

Mr. President, that is my speech. I think Mr. Buchwach has stated unanswerable observations as to the public policy involved in this issue. I think the time has come for members of all parties in the Senate to keep faith with our own long-time promises on the issue, as set forth in party platforms and in the speeches of candidates of our parties in various election campaigns. I believe that both Hawaii and Alaska deserve statehood on their merits; and that is why I propose to vote for it, and am ready to vote for it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business in Senate bill 49, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before the Senator begins his speech, I wonder if he will yield to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For what purpose?

Mr. MAGNUSON. For a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Meetings of the Appropriations Committee are about to begin, and I must leave the floor for that reason; but, having in mind the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, I shall, because of my deep interest in the subject, read his speech. A great many other Senators are in the same position with me, especially members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, what always puzzles me is how Senators can read all that is said on the floor of the Senate and also attend meetings of committees. If they were to read everything that is said on the floor, I am sure 24 hours a day would not be sufficient. It is utterly impossible for Members to read all that is said on the floor and also attend meetings of committees. That is one reason why I cannot understand why the Senate should wish to take on additional burdens, such as statehood legislation for Hawaii, when Senators cannot listen to the debate and attend to the other duties already imposed upon them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if statehood were granted, it would relieve us of a great deal of the burden.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In what way?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would relieve us of the necessity of making annual appropriations for Territories, for one thing. That takes a great deal of time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The making of appropriations is only a part of our task, it seems to me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Granting statehood would relieve us of all kinds of responsibilities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If that is the case, why do we not take in the rest of the world as States? Then we would not have any problems left at all.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think that observation is pertinent at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To come back to the original idea about attendance on the floor, which was referred to previously, I believe, in all fairness, that the subject of commonwealth status, as proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and myself, has not been adequately discussed.

Certainly there is no effort on our part to delay a vote. The statehood bill was laid aside last week for the purpose of considering the Chavez election case and the excise-tax bill. Actually very little time has been devoted to the debate on the pending bill, and even less to the alternative proposal which we are offering, namely, that of commonwealth status.

What disturbs me is that I am positive, in spite of the hopes expressed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], very few Members of the Senate have

given serious attention to the alternative proposal of commonwealth status.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Arkansas will recognize the fact, I am sure, that there is a vast difference between the commonwealth status of Puerto Rico and the commonwealth status which is proposed for Hawaii and for Alaska.

In the case of Puerto Rico, the people of Puerto Rico desired that kind of status, and Congress gave them what they wished. On the other hand, in the case of Hawaii, the people of that Territory have no desire for commonwealth status, and in the case of Alaska, people who live there have no desire for commonwealth status. If we were to pass a bill granting commonwealth status to those Territories, it would be absolutely meaningless, because the people of those Territories would not accept that status.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe the question has been presented to the people of Hawaii. They were asked whether they wanted to form a state. I do not believe the people have seriously considered the proposal, any more than the Senate has seriously considered it.

Furthermore, I do not believe it is a matter to be decided on the passing whimsy of this or that Territory. It is a matter involving the fundamental structure of our Government, and it should be decided on the basis of what is of real benefit and importance to the long-term interests of the 48 States, not merely on what a dependency or Territory wishes to do about it. I believe the wishes of the people of Hawaii and Alaska are certainly secondary.

Much has been said about the promises which allegedly have been made. I did not promise anything in connection with this subject, nor did most of the other Members of the Senate. Such statements are assumptions which are now being stated as facts. The offhand statements of policy which are made in party platforms, practically without real consideration, and with the adoption of which we are all familiar, are not binding. It is not that anyone is trying to deceive anyone else; it is simply the political practice of both parties to make promises when they anticipate a vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to state that the Senator from Arkansas is eminently correct in what he said about the fact that the people of Alaska and of Hawaii have had no opportunity to vote on the subject of commonwealth status. In Alaska, in 1940, when the people voted, the sole question was, "Do you favor statehood for Alaska?" That was the only question on which they were permitted to vote. Nine thousand three hundred and twenty people voted in favor of statehood, and 6,822 people voted against statehood for Alaska. That was the extent of the expression of the people's wishes.

In 1941, the question submitted to the people of Hawaii was, "Do you favor statehood for Hawaii?" They have never been given the opportunity to vote on the question, "Do you favor statehood, or would you prefer commonwealth status, or some other alternative?" They have had submitted to them only these loaded questions, in connection with which they had the opportunity to vote only for statehood, even though they may not have favored it at that particular time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a brief observation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How brief an observation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. An observation of about 1½ minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the pending subject?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington for 1½ minutes, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish the record to be absolutely clear. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has referred to the desire of the people of Alaska to have their Territory become a State as a passing whimsey on their part. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has suggested that they did not have an opportunity to vote on the alternative, namely, the so-called commonwealth status.

Mr. President, every time there has been an expression of opinion in Alaska regarding this subject, the great majority of Alaskans, during the past 20 years with which I am familiar—and perhaps even previous to that—have always stated they wanted statehood. I do not believe such an expression can be characterized as a passing whimsey on their part. It is a very serious matter to them, much too serious to be whimsical about.

I believe if a vote were held in Alaska today, the vote in favor of statehood would be even higher than it was previously. The people of Alaska understand the alternative of commonwealth status. This whole subject receives wide publicity in Alaska. All the newspapers have discussed the subject thoroughly. I could bring many editorials and news articles to the Senate dealing with the subject. The people of Alaska have always wanted statehood.

Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. MONRONEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, why does the Senator from Washington believe that the people of Alaska know all about commonwealth status? Has the Senator gone to that Territory and discussed the matter with the Alaskans, and has he pointed out to them the great advantage of that status?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Washington, of course, has not talked with all the people in Alaska personally.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not? It would not take too long to do so. There

are not so many people in Alaska, after all.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not take so long as it would take to contact all the people of Arkansas, because the communications in Alaska are much better than they are in Arkansas. I have talked to hundreds of Alaskans with respect to this subject. I have discussed it with them in private conversations and in meetings. They understand what is meant by commonwealth status. Perhaps they do not understand it in the great detail being suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Arkansas, and the Senator from Florida but, when all is said and done, they do want statehood. The people of Alaska are intelligent. They are well informed. There is not much else to do there in the winter but to read, and they do read everything they can get their hands on. I believe they are very well informed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Washington, when he speaks about the great demonstration in favor of statehood for Alaska, that they have had only one vote. That was in 1940. There were 9,630 persons for statehood and 6,822 against it. That does not look to me like an overwhelming demand for statehood, considered together with the fact that, although in the Territorial legislature in 1951 there was pending a memorial urging the Congress of the United States to grant statehood to Alaska, the legislature did not even adopt that memorial. As a matter of fact, after the Alaska statehood bill had been defeated, they sent to Congress a memorial saying they would like to be relieved from Federal taxes, which indicates that had they known about commonwealth status at that time they would have been overwhelmingly in favor of it, as I think they now are.

I thought the Senator from Washington might be interested in those facts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure he would be interested.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. In regard to the statement by the Senator from Washington that the people of Alaska understand exactly what we are talking about with reference to commonwealth status, I should like to say that if the people of Alaska are so much better informed than are the Members of the Senate on this subject, I think it might be wise to have a quorum call so that we can get perhaps a half dozen Senators on the floor and have them understand what we are talking about. I dislike to think that the citizens of Alaska, in the frozen north woods have information with reference to commonwealth status which is not possessed by approximately 80 of the 96 Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that many Members of the Senate are not so well informed on this question as they should be. None of us is well informed

on all questions which come before the Senate. But the people of Alaska have a direct interest in this question. I think I know them better than does any other Member of the Senate, personally, and in every other way, and I believe if an election were held in Alaska at this time the majority of the citizen would vote for statehood.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Florida has stated that 9,000 citizens of Alaska wanted statehood at the time the vote was taken, and 6,000 of them did not. I think it would be wise not to be rushed into a statehood program which would change the basic fundamental structure of the land union of the United States.

The purpose of my asking the Senator from Arkansas to yield so that I might suggest the absence of a quorum was to get more Senators into the Chamber. Senators are sworn to defend the Constitution of the United States, which I think implies defense against changing the basic structure which is part and parcel of our greatness. For that reason, I hope the junior Senator from Arkansas will permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I must attend a meeting of the Appropriations Committee, but I should like to say that I think I can give Senators an understanding of this question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the Senator from Washington is well informed on the subject of commonwealth status. He was present last week when I discussed the matter. But I should like to have many other Members of the Senate present. Perhaps they know something of the failures of other nations which have tried the system of overseas representation in their parliaments and the bad results which have occurred.

If the junior Senator from Arkansas will yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum—

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, provided I shall not lose the floor. But before I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, I will yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I was interested in the comment which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma made regarding the Senator from Washington as being one man who understood the question of commonwealth status, and was opposed to it. If others of us understand it, will we also be opposed to it?

Mr. MONRONEY. We hope to present the facts, and we believe that if a few more Members of this distinguished body could be present and given an understanding of what we mean by commonwealth status, we would have a better chance to inform them as to the grave change which is being suggested in our historic pattern of land-union States by going 2,000 miles over international waters to bring in a new State,



and crossing over 1,500 miles of the territory of a sovereign nation, Canada, to bring in another State.

If the Senator from Kansas would cooperate in having more of the members of his own party present in the Senate, only two of whom are now on the floor, it would be a great benefit.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma says there are only two Members present on the majority side. For 20 minutes this afternoon there was only one Member present on the minority side.

Mr. MONRONEY. When word leaked out that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas was going to speak, a number of Senators came into the Chamber. If word could only leak out to the Senate Office Building, perhaps most of the chairs on this side of the aisle would be filled and most of the seats on the majority side would be filled as we explain the reasons why we feel that the commonwealth status might well be preferred by the majority of the people of Alaska. After all, there comes a time when 165 million people must also be considered when we are discussing a fundamental change in our basic geographic structure of a solid, united Union.

Therefore, Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Arkansas will yield for that purpose, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Green	Mundt
Barrett	Griswold	Potter
Beall	Hayden	Purtell
Bricker	Hendrickson	Smathers
Butler, Md.	Jackson	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Thye
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Watkins
Daniel	Knowland	Wiley
Dworshak	Maybank	Young
Flanders	McCarthy	
Fulbright	Monroney	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request the attendance of the absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). A quorum is present.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it take a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to say for the RECORD that it was with great reluctance that I yielded for the purpose of a quorum call. I had no illusions about the matter. I did not expect any Senators who entered the Chamber in response to the quorum call to remain. I think there are very few more now present than were present when the quorum call was started. That is an old custom in this body.

By way of introduction, I wish to say a few words about the preliminary remarks which have been made.

First, it seems to me that the significance of the desires of the people of Hawaii or Alaska is quite a secondary consideration. The primary consideration, it seems to me, should be the effect of granting statehood to Hawaii or Alaska upon the continuity, strength, and unity of the present Union of 48 States. I hope we can approach the question from that point of view.

Furthermore, so far as I am concerned, while the issue of communism is important whenever it arises in any area of the country, it is not a determinative issue here, it seems to me. I believe that the remark of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] that the Communists oppose statehood must be based on a very questionable analysis. I hope no effort is made to identify those who oppose the bill with communism. I am sure that was not the intent.

It seems to me that if the Communists were so strong in the islands as has been alleged, they would be very strong for statehood, because, assuming that they were strong, they would have two Senators in this body, with access to various committees, such as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and others.

Therefore, if they were very strong in the islands, they would be much more likely to favor statehood for Hawaii than the present Territorial status, which gives them no entry into the Senate. I do not consider that to be the determining, or even a very important, issue, because I do not believe they control the islands, although they obviously have great influence in the labor unions dominated by Mr. Bridges.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be happy to yield in a moment.

I wish to approach the problem from the standpoint of what is for the best welfare of the 48 States. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. It was not my desire to raise the issue of communism, so far as I was personally concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am certain the Senator from Kansas did not intend to make the very common allegation or indulge in the oft-repeated implication to the effect that anyone who disagrees with another person on this subject is in some way or other influenced by communism, or follows the Communist line. I am certain that the Senator from Kansas did not intend such an implication.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I did not hear the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, and probably the statement has been corrected by other Senators who are members of the committee. I wish to say that all the evidence I heard developed before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was to the effect that the Communist leadership in the islands was very much in favor of statehood. I did not hear any evidence at all to the effect that the Communist leadership in the islands opposed statehood.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Texas for his contribution. Being rather shrewd, the Communists, of course, know that they could bring about a great deal of confusion if statehood were granted to Hawaii. From our own knowledge of the operations of the Federal Government, it is obvious that it has much more business to consider than it can well attend to. That is why

it has been impossible to obtain a real quorum in the Senate. It has taken almost an hour to obtain a quorum on the floor, and it is not a real quorum, because any Senator can see that even after all the effort of having the Sergeant at Arms request the attendance of Senators, not more than 8 or 10 Senators are now on the floor. It is not because Senators do not wish to be on the floor; it is because many committees are meeting. We know that the Committee on Appropriations is holding a hearing this afternoon. Furthermore, every Member of the Senate has much more work to do in his office than ever before. That is why we do not have a better attendance on the floor of the Senate.

Nevertheless, there are those who would burden the Central Government with still more duties, by granting statehood to these two Territories. I believe that fact in itself is of some significance.

I should like at this point to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. I should like to read one paragraph, because it highlights the importance of the basic question involved in the pending bill. He writes:

However, this does not mean that the only choice is between statehood and colonialism. Britain faced the same problem when it decided to grant commonwealth status to its former great dominions. These had first been colonies. It was not practical to grant them the equivalent of statehood because the local affairs of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, and Ceylon could not, in fact, be concentrated in the single city of London and managed in the single Parliament at Westminster. The commonwealth concept was invented to solve Britain's dilemma over the impossibility of statehood and the intolerability of continued colonial status for its mature offspring.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEHOOD OR COMMONWEALTH?

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—It would seem to this writer that Senators MONROE, FULBRIGHT, SMATHERS, and DANIEL made a constructive and long-overdue contribution to public thinking about the relationship of the United States to its outlying possessions when they proposed that Alaska and Hawaii be given not statehood but commonwealth status.

Such a proposal is bound to be a bitter disappointment to the good citizens of Alaska and Hawaii, most of whom are as American in every respect as the inhabitants of Massachusetts, New York, Tennessee, or California, and who have had the prospect of statehood dangled before their eyes by the party platforms of both Republicans and Democrats for a generation.

The proposal would in effect take away from Alaska and Hawaii something which has been promised repeatedly and which both have had much reason to anticipate at the present sitting of the Congress of the United States.

However, the intensity of the debate in Congress and the obvious reluctance of many Members of both House and Senate to proceed to the promised action attest to the existence of a deep and unresolved doubt about the wisdom of extending the territorial frontiers of the United States beyond those which now exist, and which have been estab-

lished and unchanged since Arizona and New Mexico were admitted to the Union in 1912.

The reasons usually given for hesitation about this step have not, I think, been the true reasons. Certainly it would raise serious questions if one were to be given statehood and the other denied it because of calculations as to the probable party alignment of its future Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress. Certainly, also, there would be an indefensible violation of the concepts of Americanism if any Territory were denied admission on the ground that some of its citizens are of Asiatic rather than of European extraction.

The true reason for hesitation about statehood arises rather, I think, out of the fact that Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Marianas are all Territories noncontiguous to the existing Territory of the United States and that history is liberally sprinkled with case examples of the unwisdom of attempting to govern noncontiguous territories from a capital under a single parliament.

The English colonists who settled on the American seaboard were as English when they arrived as were their compatriots who remained at home, and continued to be as English until well after the separation. Yet there arose between them differences of interest which forced their separation.

There can be no serious doubt that a permanent colonial status is as intolerable under the American flag today as it was under the British royal standard in 1776. It has been the impropriety and the impermanence of colonial status which has brought the project of statehood of Alaska and Hawaii to its present position on the legislative calendar in Washington. American citizens of Alaska and Hawaii cannot properly be relegated much longer to the condition of second-class citizens.

However, this does not need to mean that the only choice is between statehood and colonialism. Britain faced the same problem when it decided to grant commonwealth status to its former great dominions. These had first been colonies. It was not practical to grant them the equivalent of statehood because the local affairs of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, and Ceylon could not, in fact, be concentrated in the single city of London and managed in the single Parliament at Westminster. The commonwealth concept was invented to solve Britain's dilemma over the impossibility of statehood and the intolerability of continued colonial status for its mature offspring.

The United States has, in fact, already applied this same solution in the case of Puerto Rico. It is a self-governing Commonwealth, under the American flag. It is sovereign, independent, and equal, but has of its own free choice, and for sound and practical reasons, entrusted its foreign and defense policy to the Government in Washington. It has the right to withdraw this trust and break this association of mutual convenience any time it chooses. Puerto Rico is not a colony, a Territory, or a possession. It is as independent of Washington as Canada is of London.

There is no reason why Alaska and Hawaii should not be able to prosper under commonwealth status, as Canada and Australia have prospered. It is an honorable and dignified status. Its terms can be adjusted to fit the common interests of all concerned. It would recognize the basic and true reason for hesitation in Washington about statehood, for it would leave unchanged the established boundaries of the American Union.

The relationship of the 48 States to each other is a fixed and settled thing. The relationship of such a union to any outlying colony, territory, possession, or commonwealth cannot be fixed or certain for all time. To attempt to fix it so is, I think, to invite

future, unforeseeable and undesirable complications. The Soviet Union has not even attempted it with its contiguous satellites. Britain had to give up the Republic of Ireland although more Irishmen live in England than in Ireland. A commonwealth is flexible, and can adjust itself to the future. A union is not flexible, and can be extended overseas only at great risks and hazards.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit that the same reasoning applies to our present situation. No one denies that it would be an unprecedented step on our part if we were to grant statehood to Territories lying beyond our borders, or to noncontiguous territories. It is a very serious problem. I am confident some Senators, in considering the status of Hawaii, have thought that perhaps, in view of the growing difficulties with the great empire of Russia, this country should resort to imperialism. Whether statehood for Hawaii is considered a step in that direction, I do not know. I do not believe the sponsors of the pending legislation have that in mind, or that this effort is merely the first step toward an unlimited expansion of our direct power, a reversal—if that were the fact—of our historic policy. I do not believe that is the motive.

However, once we break the traditional policy which we have voluntarily accepted, namely, that of limiting statehood to contiguous territory on the North American Continent, we certainly open the door, and it would be difficult from that time to resist proposals to extend statehood to any of the other noncontiguous territories which may desire statehood and who may find sponsors for such proposals in the Congress.

It seems to me that the reference made by Mr. Harsch to the situation of Great Britain reflects the wise way for us to proceed on the basis of a long-term future, and I believe it calls for a consideration of two of the principal examples we have had in this field, that is, the British Commonwealth and France. They are two of the greatest colonial powers in the world.

Generally speaking, Britain has followed the principle that Mr. Harsch mentioned, that is, rather than extending her direct power by granting colonies the right to have representation in Parliament, Britain has followed the commonwealth approach, by granting a greater and greater degree of self-government to its various colonies throughout the world; in contrast to the French experience.

I have before me a book from which I should like to read a paragraph, as a taking-off place with regard to that point. I read from the book entitled "European and Comparative Government," chapter 7:

The special genius of the British nation has long been expressed in its adaptability to regional differences and change. While French and German administrations stress uniformity and logic, British administration suggests diversity and experience. As a result, the British Empire today is an extraordinarily complex organization, which is more easily described than defined. Its expansion is immense; it comprises approximately one-fourth of the land surface of the earth and nearly a quarter of the earth's population.



Its parts may be found on every continent and in every ocean. There are few important maps on which a section is not printed red, the traditional color of the British Empire.

In contrast to that, there is a paragraph on the French system:

France's colonial policy has always differed from that of Great Britain. While the latter emphasized the preservation of national cultures, laws, and habits, France stressed assimilation and created disadvantages for the unassimilated. But assimilation meant abandonment of native habits and laws and the acceptance of the foreign ways of France. In consequence of this policy and an inflexible colonial administration, bloody riots and outright colonial wars had at one time or another swept all France's major overseas possessions. They were suppressed with considerable harshness, which naturally caused further friction. Later, the swift defeat of France by Germany in 1940 weakened her position considerably, and the invasion of north Africa by American and British troops further demonstrated to the natives France's fall from the role of a great power. A reconsideration of the place which overseas France was to occupy in the French Empire was therefore in order.

I continue to read:

Administratively, historically, and culturally, France's overseas possessions present considerable variety. There are the 3 administrative departments of Algeria and the 4 departments of France's prerévolutionary colonies, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Réunion, and French Guiana. These seven departments are considered part of France proper and are therefore under the Minister of the Interior.

In view of our own experience, when we contemplate and consider the experience of the French and their attempt to integrate Algeria and make it a part of metropolitan France, it is clear that that in itself does not necessarily seem to be the proper solution. In North Africa we see a situation somewhat similar to that in Hawaii. The French in Algeria, known as *Colons*, went there from France, and they are the dominant group. Similarly, a large number of American citizens or descendants of the early missionaries live in Hawaii. So there is some similarity of relationship; yet the relationship has in no wise been as satisfactory as the relationship of the British Parliament with the self-governing dominions of the British Commonwealth.

I do not wish to leave the impression that I think everything Great Britain has done is correct. We know she has made mistakes, but I think it will be admitted, Mr. President, that Great Britain has shown a great talent for government. Great Britain has managed to create all types of governments, and has shown a great genius for government. I submit that her experience in this field seems to indicate that the wiser course for us to follow at the present time is to create what we call a commonwealth status for both Hawaii and Alaska.

It has been stated that it is a discreditable status, that it confers only second-class citizenship. Many of us have visited countries composing the British commonwealth, such as Canada, Bermuda, and others. I have yet to find any citizen of Canada or of Bermuda expressing in the slightest degree any feeling of inferiority with respect to his

status as compared with the status of an inhabitant of the British Isles. I think it is a completely false issue. There is no reason why the citizens of Hawaii under a commonwealth status should feel inferior to citizens of the mainland.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that through the long years of British history people who reside in overseas areas have realized that their problems were more or less local in nature as to self-government and interdependent with reference to the strength of the homeland in the British Isles, and they do not expect or demand the right to be the tail which wags the dog of the British Empire?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. They recognize the practical facts of life and that the conditions in their respective areas, scattered all over the world, are very different. It would be impossible today, I think, for members of the Parliament in London to understand and to legislate intelligently for all those various areas.

With reference to Hawaii, there are a few Members of this body who have spent possibly a week there. It is customary with most of us to attempt to acquire very quickly knowledge of a complex situation. We expect to legislate, and we shall have to legislate to a far greater degree than we now do. Our interests are largely in the military aspects of Hawaii, but I think we will become involved in a much more intimate way in studying problems in Hawaii, and when we do, we will find them very different from mainland problems. We are going very far afield if we take into the Union as a State a subtropical community where a great variety of citizens live. I do not mean to give the impression that they are inferior in any way; they are simply different.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would not the Senator say that with a provision in the bill that all revenue originating in the Territory shall be levied by their own legislature, which shall also determine how it shall be spent, and otherwise granting the right of complete self-government, a commonwealth status would serve better to give them a greater degree of self-determination?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that to be true. This statehood proposal constitutes the first break in our traditional policy with reference to noncontiguous territory. Its adoption would set a precedent which may gradually be extended in this field, and I do not think that in the long run it is a wise course to pursue. We should give them self-government. They understand their problems better than we shall ever understand them.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They know better than we do what should be done to solve their problems. I think the Senator from Oklahoma will agree that he has all he can do to keep up with developments in his own State, as is the case

with me. Yet we are called upon to vote on this issue.

Mr. MONRONEY. At that point, would not the junior Senator from Arkansas say that while Commonwealth status would serve the islands better, it would also be better for us? To have a high degree of self-government in the overseas area would not change the historic pattern of the United States whose problems are distinctly our own and should not be subjected to the insular viewpoint that would obtain in Hawaii or in Alaska, which are far removed from the continental land mass of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely correct. That is the other side of the coin. The Senator knows that in this country and in many other countries divisions in parliamentary bodies are often very close. In the Senate of the United States there is a difference of one between the majority and minority parties. We would not expect peoples who have not known the same traditions of government that we have to believe just as we do. They may be just as good. It is not a question of being better or worse. They are simply different. They do not have participation in their government in the same sense that we enjoy because of the traditions growing out of our constitutional system which have developed during the course of many years. They have a different approach to their problems. Yet, we would be accepting four additional Senators. We would be giving them a determining power in the Senate such as we have seen exercised by a few votes in the past few weeks.

Mr. MONRONEY. If Alaska and Hawaii had had statehood in World War II, when they were both in an exposed area in relation to the far eastern aspects of the war, we would have had at least four United States Senators insisting on certain measures because of their geographic location, far removed from the mainland of the United States, when the overall strategy of the war was first to knock out the armies of Germany before the final showdown came with Japan, there would have been special pleaders concerned only with their individual locations and not with the safety and security of the 48 States comprising the land mass in the mid-North American Continent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is quite right. Things could have been much worse if such a situation had existed at that time; and in the future there would be a tendency to sacrifice the welfare of the great body of 165 million persons to the interests of relatively small groups, because in the present situation, at least, the small groups would have very great power.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I said the other day in my speech, I vote in Hawaii would have the impact of 33 votes in New York, the largest State in the Union. It would have the impact of 22 votes in California or Pennsylvania. So 350,000 Hawaiians would be given the same power to name 2 United States Senators which fifteen million or twenty million persons in New York State or other large States have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oklahoma is quite correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am certain the Senator from Arkansas would want the RECORD to show that when he was speaking, prior to his colloquy with the Senator from Oklahoma, of alien background, he was speaking primarily of Hawaii, and not of Alaska.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. By aliens I mean persons not native American citizens. I assume the Eskimos do not have the same background as to political practices or in a legal sense or in their general cultural development as we do. Their traditions and cultural backgrounds are not quite the same as or similar to those of the great body of the inhabitants of the mainland.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the Senator from Arkansas must realize that 98 percent or 99 percent of the population of Alaska are citizens of the United States, who have a background of having lived on the mainland which constitutes the 48 States of the Union, and who have gone to Alaska and pioneered in that Territory. I cannot think of any people in Alaska, with the exception of a few Filipinos who work in the canneries, and who are peculiarly adapted to that kind of work, who do not have such a background.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is there no native population in Alaska?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but it is a relatively small number, perhaps 1 or 2 percent. I am certain Eskimos will not present any problem with respect to the typical American tradition. The Senator from Arkansas can allay his fears on that score.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington seems to be touchy about that. It is not a question, in any sense, of being inferior to Americans; I simply think they are different.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot see much difference between a Scandinavian in Alaska and a Scandinavian in Washington; they are both the same kind of people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator see any difference between an American and an Eskimo?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think there is some difference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator from Washington see any difference between an American and a Japanese or a Chinese? I certainly would be the last one to intimate in any way that those people are inferior. I think they have different backgrounds. I think their approach to government is a little different from ours. I can see no reason why they should not go through a much greater period of self-government, and have complete self-government, not the kind of paternalism the United States now exercises.

We speak about the Territories having had a long period of tutelage, but I do not believe they have had complete responsibility. They have not elected their own governors or had the responsibility of managing their own affairs. I do not see anything in the argument

which opposes giving them complete self-government as an alternative to statehood. It can be a step to statehood, as well as to complete independence, as was the case with Canada.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator's statement in that regard may properly apply to the Hawaiian Islands. I forget the percentage, but is not a very large percentage of Hawaiians non-American?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield, I shall be glad to supply the percentages.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. In Alaska the 1950 census showed a population of 120,643, of which some 31,000 were Aleuts, Indians, and Eskimos. Less than 100,000 of the population are of the Caucasian race. The remainder are Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And they are a very fine people.

Mr. SMATHERS. They are a very fine people.

The figures for Hawaii come from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, published by the Delegate from Hawaii, and they show that the Hawaiians, including part Hawaiians, comprise 19 percent of the population; Caucasians comprise 14 percent; Chinese, 6.9 percent; Japanese, 40.6 percent; and Filipinos, 13.5 percent. In other words, approximately 80 percent of the population of Hawaii is Oriental in origin or background.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Arkansas that that does not mean they are not a wonderful people or a good people. But when someone says, as Delegate Farrington is reported to have said in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, they are not of Oriental background, he is flying in the face of his own figures, because the facts are as I have stated them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not say that Oriental people or any other people are not capable of developing an effective, satisfactory system of self-government. The British have demonstrated that with all types of people. I have before me a fairly recent list showing the great variety of people in the various British possessions.

Of a total population of 603 million, 529 million are in independent countries, ranging all the way from Canada, Australia, South Africa, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, with complete independence, down to the smaller possessions. I shall not read them all. The British have done a remarkable job. They have demonstrated from experience that such a status is far more satisfactory to the people involved.

Actually, in colonies such as Bermuda, which does not have complete independence, as well as in units having commonwealth status, the people are happier than are the people in the French integrated departments, such as Algiers. I do not wish to be too critical of the French. They have followed what they thought was the logical course. It seemed very logical to the French to allow Algiers to have senators and representatives in the Parliament in Paris.

But any of us who read the newspapers at all know that it has brought confusion and continuing friction. If Algiers had had complete local self-government, in which it could have developed a fairer, more equitable sharing in government than it has today, in my opinion, it would be better off.

The account in the book which I have mentioned, which I shall not read, indicates that the friction continues partly because of the influence of the 400,000 Colons, as they are called, who are Frenchmen living in Algiers, who tend to dominate the country. They have never gotten together and created a local self-government as effectively as have the British in most of their possessions.

With few exceptions, I think the British have created a tolerable and acceptable government in their various possessions.

Not that such a government has not, of course, been subject to criticism. It was not acceptable to any of the Thirteen Original Colonies which are now the United States, because they broke away from the British Government. I do not mean to leave the impression that the British forms of government always have been perfect. But, on balance, as we look at the British forms of government in the light of several centuries of development and relationships, they have proved to be very satisfactory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to place in the RECORD the number of Eskimos living in Alaska. When the Senator from Florida speaks of Aleuts and Indians, he should remember conditions which existed in all the Western States, where there were large numbers of Indian natives. These Aleuts and Indians in Alaska are likewise natives. That is not generally true of Hawaii. Oriental people went to Hawaii, and it was necessary to absorb them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator from Washington does not think at this late date the problem of natives in Alaska and Hawaii should be solved in the way it was solved for the large number of Indians in the Western States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We took in the Indians when the States were admitted. I suppose there were some Indians in Arkansas; I know there were a large number in Oklahoma, when Oklahoma came into the Union.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think one of the blacker chapters in United States history is the way the Indians have been treated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not say that was the way the Indians and Aleuts in Alaska would be treated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The inference was that the natives of Alaska would be disposed of as were the Indians in the western area of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I did not intend to leave any such inference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Indians of the West were not absorbed. States were made from the Territories in which they lived. But I do not wish to recall that sad chapter now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I intended to leave no such inference at all; I was merely



pointing out that there are natives in Alaska, and the natives in Alaska probably would be in no greater proportion than the proportion of Indians who were absorbed into the population of Kansas or other Western States when they were taken into the Union.

I agree that Hawaii presents a different situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They will be much better able to look after their own interests in Alaska, for example, if they have local self-government, and can feel that it is their government, and that they will be able to participate in the election of their Governor. After all, they compose almost 20 percent of the population, and they could have a considerable influence, if they wished to exercise it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact, from a practical standpoint, with all due regard to the great enthusiasm which my distinguished friend, the Senator from Washington, has for the Territory of Alaska, that that land mass, large though it is, is going to get lost somewhere in the 100 yards between the Senate and the House of Representatives, and that the prospect of getting 2 Republican Members of the United States Senate from Hawaii is the main reason why the pending bill is now before the Senate, that Hawaii will be properly taken care of, and that Alaska will be left out of the bill when it emerges from the conference with the House? We are told that definitely the House will never pass a bill granting statehood to Alaska; that the skids are greased to grant statehood to Hawaii; and that somewhere between the Senate and the House that rather large Territory will somehow get lost. So we need not worry so much about the Aleuts, or public housing, or igloos for Eskimos in the Aleutian Islands, our problem is concentrated on the proposal to go 2,000 miles offshore, across international waters, to set up a State which, in a closely divided Senate, could be the tail that wags the dog in a Union of 48 States with a population of approximately 165 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Oklahoma's present political analysis of the situation is correct. However, it is hoped we may be able to change the apparently avowed policy on the part of those who brought up the Hawaiian bill. I should like also to correct the Senator in one respect; there are no Eskimos on the Aleutian Islands.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to say to the Senator from Washington, in all seriousness, that I do not think he should favor statehood, in view of the very serious question in the minds of a very large number, if not a majority, of Senators. The aspect which is decisive in my mind is that if this step is taken, it will be irrevocable. The Senator from Washington will admit it would mark a rather drastic change in our traditions. Once taken, there would be no retreat. One of the principles of this Government is that whenever there is a large group, as many as even one-third,

plus one, in many instances, opposing a proposal such as a constitutional amendment, we will say, "Stop; we will not do it"—for very good reasons.

With regard to the present question of statehood, there are more than a third, possibly close to a majority, of the membership of this body who have a grave question about the wisdom of the proposed step. It would be an irrevocable step; we could not go back.

In contrast to that step, if the commonwealth status is adopted, I think it cannot be denied, in all fairness, that it would permit experience in government in those Territories. It would also accomplish other purposes. It would afford an opportunity for the development of political talent and genius in the two commonwealths which would be created.

If the people of Hawaii and Alaska under a commonwealth status should prove themselves really effective in managing their political institutions, should show a capacity to develop real talent and leaders, and should develop an effective government, then, if they should later still insist that they wished to be States, after having demonstrated a capacity to run their affairs very efficiently, I am sure their representatives could come to Washington and get a far greater following in their behalf than they have at present.

I do not for a minute take the view that the two Territories should never be States. I do not know, but perhaps at some time in the future we will change our whole approach to this matter. We do not know what our relations will be with other governments, for example, our relations vis-à-vis Russia.

The Senate is being asked to take an irrevocable step which will change our traditional concept of what constitutes the United States of America, and once such a step is taken we cannot turn back.

What the sponsors of commonwealth status are asking the Senate to do is take a step which, it seems to me, is along the road toward the development of political wisdom and a sound political system in the two Territories. If the Territories accomplish such a step successfully, and if, after due and further consideration of the problem, the Senate and the House should come to the conclusion that it would be advisable to have the two Territories become States, that could always be done. If commonwealth status were granted, it could always be corrected if it turned out to be a mistake; whereas under the proposal for statehood, if the advice of those advocating statehood should be followed, and statehood were granted, we could not retrace the step.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the statement of the Senator concerning the irrevocability of granting statehood, and what he has stated would be the situation in the event commonwealth status proved to be successful. In that status revenues arising within the Territories would be left within the areas in order to develop a high type of economy and prosperity. We do not know what the future will hold, or what other great governments may disintegrate, or what other countries in other areas in the

world may seek to associate themselves with the United States. If we have experience with overseas areas under a commonwealth status, we will not be embarrassed by such areas as Guam, the Marianas, the Virgin Islands, or any other territorial groups which might later want to become associated with the United States as States, along with the 48 land-union States.

Therefore, I think that at this point in our history, when we may be setting an irrevocable pattern for admission as full States of far-off overseas areas, it is time for us to stop, look, and listen, and to make sure, while there is still time, whether we want to remain the United States of America in a closely knit contiguous land mass and land union, in the midsection of the North American Continent, or whether we want to become a group of associated States of America, disregard the question of contiguity and ignore the close association with a continuous history and with traditions and governmental problems, economical and political, that the 48 States have always enjoyed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I was interested in listening to the argument in favor of delaying statehood. I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator regarding the irrevocability of the action once statehood is granted. I think it is a fact that it has been 70 years since Alaska became a Territory and 54 years since Hawaii became a Territory. It seems to me that is a rather long period to require such Territories to serve what has been called tutelage for statehood.

In Kansas this year we are celebrating the 100th anniversary of the admission of Kansas as a State. Kansas was a Territory only 7 years before it became a State. It seems to me that the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska have had considerable time to prove themselves.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the main thing wrong with the Senator's argument is that the Territories have not been given the degree of self-government and the opportunity to develop their own governments they should have had. I myself regret that they were not a long time ago given the right to elect their own governors and manage their own fiscal and other affairs or at least given a larger degree of responsibility in such matters. I think they would have developed better if they had been given such rights. Those advocating statehood would be on much stronger ground if during the last 25 years, or even less, Hawaii had had commonwealth status. We would now be in a better position to judge whether it would be entitled to statehood. My opinion is that the Hawaiians themselves would be very content with commonwealth status. Has any Senator present heard any complaint because Canada has not been integrated into the British Union as a shire in the United Kingdom? I never hear such a complaint. All those who have

gone through that development are, to my knowledge, quite satisfied with it.

As of today, those who are complaining and who are the source of difficulty reside in parts of North Africa, and have a relationship different from that under a commonwealth status. In fact, their status is somewhat similar to the one which some persons wish to create in this instance by making these Territories into States.

Mr. President, I think the real answer to the desires of many of these people, especially the people of Hawaii—because Hawaii is more highly developed both economically and, I think, politically—and to their urge for participation in government would be to let them have commonwealth status. If, after they had had commonwealth status for several years they still wished to become States, such a desire certainly would then be more worthy of consideration than at this time, when they have not exercised such powers.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thoroughly agree with the statement the Senator from Arkansas has made, namely, that undoubtedly Hawaii and Alaska would be better off at this time if they had previously been permitted to have the form of government we now recommend for them, under the commonwealth-status proposal.

However, let me point out that the Senator from Kansas should never feel apologetic for the treatment given by the United States Government to Hawaii and Alaska. For instance, when Alaska was admitted as a Territory in 1867, she had a total population of 29,000 approximately 27,000 of whom were Indians and Eskimos, the remainder included 1,422 of mixed racial stock, 483 Russians, 156 Americans, and 200 foreigners, non-Russian or non-native.

Let us consider the progress Alaska has made since that time. Annually the Congress has been appropriating an average of approximately \$120 million for Alaska, and has been building up Alaska to the point where she can, with some degree of justification, request from us a status different from the one she has thus far had.

When we consider the situation of Hawaii, we find it to be much the same. In 1952, the United States Government gave Hawaii \$287 million; in 1951, \$247 million; and so the appropriations go. Hawaii has been prospering greatly under the system of government which thus far we have given to her.

So I do not believe we should in any event apologize for the treatment those Territories have thus far received. Certainly we have done right by them.

I agree with the basic principles enunciated by the Senator from Arkansas, namely, that the time has come when these Territories are entitled to elect their own officials. That is what I understand the commonwealth-status pro-

posal is designed to do as well as to aid them in the development of their resources.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is. When commonwealth status was proposed by some of us previously, it was not brought to a final decision. I believe this is the proper time to deal with it. Of course the war delayed action on it for quite a time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The figures cited by the Senator from Florida are really for expenditures for our own benefit, because both Alaska and Hawaii constitute our frontier.

On the other hand, I should like to obtain from the Appropriations Committee the figures for strictly civil appropriations, so that we might ascertain how well these two Territories have been treated. Certainly most of the expenditures thus far referred to have been for military purposes.

Some persons have said—many when speaking in jest—that if Alaska cannot become a State after having had more than 80 years of probation, perhaps she should be allowed to form the independent country of Alaska, inasmuch as by such means Alaska would, no doubt, under our foreign aid program, be able to borrow much greater sums than she has ever been able to obtain as a Territory. In that way we are told that Alaska would be much better off. I believe there is some truth to that observation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If Alaska and Hawaii became States, I believe it would be a long time before they would be able to obtain Senators to work in their interest as well as the 2 Senators from California now work in behalf of Hawaii and the 2 Senators from the State of Washington now work in behalf of Alaska. Certainly it would take a long time for them to obtain the services of Senators with as much prestige and influence. So these Territories would be giving up a great deal if they became States.

All of us admit, as the Senator from Washington has stated, that there are great natural resources in Alaska; and if Alaska is given some incentive to develop her own government, perhaps she will develop just as the various States have.

The Senator from Kansas has said Kansas has been a State for almost 100 years, and that we should consider the development which has occurred during that period. Mr. President, I do not know why Alaska cannot develop likewise, if she is given an opportunity to govern herself and to solve her own problems.

The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], great authority that he is in this field, also has to look after the State of Washington. In fact, his work in the interest of Alaska adds a great deal to his duties and burdens. I can understand that he would desire to be relieved of those additional burdens and duties, and I believe the best way for that to be done is for Alaska to be given the right of self-government, rather than to be made a State.

As I have said, the commonwealth-status proposal will, if adopted, not be an irrevocable one. In my opinion, that feature is decisive and rather controlling in connection with the pending question. If those who advocate the commonwealth-status proposal are wrong, and if their proposal is put into effect, the mistake—if it proves to be one—can be corrected next year or the following year.

On the other hand, if the proponents of the original bill are proved, by experience, to have been mistaken, nevertheless, once statehood has been conferred upon these Territories, it will be impossible to make any change. After statehood was conferred upon them, even if it proved to be a mistake, we would have to continue to follow the wrong track; and in that event no one could foresee the ultimate conclusion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me at this point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will not the Senator from Arkansas agree that, once statehood were conferred upon Alaska and Hawaii, it would be very likely that the present statehood proposal would not be confined to the two Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, but eventually it might be extended to many other areas?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. For instance, if a Senator happened to take a liking to Guam he might introduce a bill calling for statehood for Guam. Certainly it would be very difficult to maintain a successful resistance to the enactment of such a bill, if the advocates of such a proposal had, as a precedent, the granting of statehood to Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. MONRONEY. Can the Senator from Arkansas state any reason why Puerto Rico should be treated differently from Hawaii and Alaska? After all, our country has had a number of years of experience with Puerto Rico. Should she be treated differently simply because she has been an unincorporated Territory, whereas Alaska and Hawaii have been incorporated Territories? In my opinion, it will take a long time to convince many of the people of the United States of the inherent justification for making any such differentiation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly that is true. Some persons say Puerto Rico does not wish to have statehood, and seem to regard that situation as the determining factor. However, if we accept it as such and as a valid reason for making such a difference, then any Territory or area which wishes to attain statehood should be allowed to do so.

Mr. MONRONEY. Some persons seem to take the position that statehood should be sent, special delivery, to any group of people who wish to have the Territory or area in which they live become a State. On the contrary, I believe it is for the 160 million people of the present land-union of States to decide whether such additional areas should become States. Under our proposal, in the meantime, those living in the Territories will be given the right of self-government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield to



me, let me say that I admit there are some advantages to commonwealth status. I assume that Senators who favor the commonwealth-status proposal do not wish to have Alaska and Hawaii have representation in the Senate of the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. We are saying that these 2 Territories have enjoyed a completely different status from that of the present land-union of 48 States, and we do not wish these Territories to be associated any differently with the 48 land-union States. We wish these 2 Territories to have a direct relationship with us, but without our beginning to build up an empire which ultimately might become so large that the tail might be found to wag the dog—or, in short, the other areas might eventually control the present land-union of 48 States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder whether the fact that in various decisions the Supreme Court has recognized that there is a difference in the status of these Territories might help in the consideration of this case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not say there is no difference. I say the difference is not relevant or meaningful. It has nothing to do with the question of whether these two Territories should be granted statehood.

Of course there is a difference. These two Territories are different in the racial characteristics of their people and in many other ways. I must say that I can see no good argument upon which to resist Puerto Rico if she wishes to become a State, and if we think it is a good idea. I think the Puerto Ricans are convinced that they do not want to be a State, and we do not want them to be, so everyone is happy over the commonwealth status.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. It so happens that I was a member of the committee when the Puerto Rican situation was considered. I happened to be in charge of hearings when we considered the situation in Guam. It is not merely a question of what the people themselves desire. However, the situation is utterly different in the case of Hawaii and Alaska. I think the difference is brought about by the fact that they both became incorporated Territories, and were incorporated into the rest of the Union. The situation is entirely different in the case of incorporated Territories. If Guam asked for statehood, no one would say that it should be granted merely because the people themselves want it, because Guam has not been an incorporated Territory and neither has Puerto Rico.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For the life of me I can see nothing decisive about a Territory being incorporated, in relation to statehood. It is up to us to make the decision as to whether or not it is wise, considering the long-term security, prosperity, health, and satisfaction of the

people of the 48 States, to grant statehood to a Territory.

From the standpoint of efficiency and the welfare of the people themselves, I believe that they would be far better off by reason of having local control. I do not quite understand the great insistence upon the argument that they would be happier if they were States than they would be under a commonwealth status, with control over their own affairs.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon would like to suggest that there are all the differences in the world between the situation in Hawaii and Alaska, on the one hand, and that in Puerto Rico on the other. The situation in Puerto Rico was such as to require, if there were to be more than dependency rights in Puerto Rico, the adoption of some form of government such as was finally devised under what we now know as the commonwealth. That question was before one Interior and Insular Affairs Committee after another for years. This Government found it necessary, among other things, to grant to the people of Puerto Rico all the taxes of any and every character which were collected under the laws of the United States. Even then it was difficult for the people to maintain their own economy.

We must remember that on the island of Puerto Rico there is more than one person to the acre of land, and that most of the land is mountainous. There is very little that is available for agriculture. There are approximately 2,500,000 people and less than 2,500,000 acres. The result is that there was neither an adequate economic background at the time, nor was there any potential economic background in Puerto Rico. It was necessary, in a few words, that this Government bail out Puerto Rico in some way financially. That was one reason why the type of government which we now know as the commonwealth was devised.

In Hawaii there is at present a sufficient economic background. In Alaska there is a potentially sufficient economic background—neither of which exist in Puerto Rico. At the present time Federal internal-revenue taxes are assessed and collected in both Alaska and Hawaii, and those taxes are paid into the United States Treasury. For years before we granted commonwealth status to Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rican Government had had the full advantage of all such taxes, which were expendable and expended in Puerto Rico. So there is little, if any, basis for comparison of the economic factors, as between Puerto Rico on the one hand and the two Territories on the other; and when we leave the economic factors, there is no basis for comparison whatever.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I to understand from the Senator's statement that he believes statehood should be granted because such action would greatly benefit the economy of the United States? Is that his reason for it? Is it to be done for our benefit?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon takes the view that one of the first criteria which it is necessary to consider in connection with statehood is the capacity of the area to pay the overhead involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That may be a good reason, if for other reasons we want a Territory to be a State. What I am trying to get at is this: Why do we want to add another State? Is it only because the area is rich? Surely there is some other reason. What is it?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will be glad to give his reason. It is the same reason that has brought 48 States into the Union, one after another beginning with the first 13; and in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, the same reason which brought the first 13 in is still applicable. We have made the people of Alaska and the people of Hawaii citizens by giving them the Territorial status of government. Under the decisions of the courts we have given them the benefit of the Constitution. The only thing left, if we are to give them what we ourselves claim is our God-given right—complete freedom and complete equality—is to give them statehood. The question is not what it would gain for us. In my humble opinion the question is what we owe to them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What we owe to them?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then we are not doing it for our own benefit, but merely to discharge some debt which the Senator thinks we owe to them.

Mr. CORDON. In the first instance, exactly. Incidentally, we also gain some benefit when we do that. We could not release either Hawaii or Alaska. We could not say to either today, "We will give you your choice. If you desire it, you may have your independence, or we will give you statehood." We could not give them that choice, because the safety of the United States is dependent upon the military holding of both Alaska and Hawaii. So we must keep them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we owe them a debt, how can the Senator resist the argument that we owe the same debt to all the other possessions? If the proposed grant of statehood is on the basis of a moral obligation, I do not see how we can limit it short of the entire human race. Morality has a universal application. If we are that good, we ought to take them all in, ought we not? We certainly could not stop short of taking in Guam. How does the Senator justify stopping short of Guam?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is now discussing an utter absurdity, as he well knows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator that it is an absurdity.

Mr. CORDON. It is a nice basis for argument, but it has no meaning, and no applicability whatever to the situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I feel that that is exactly true with regard to the hypothetical idea of a debt which we owe them. I think the basis on which we should consider the question is primarily

the effect upon this country. In my view, the real interest is that of the 165 million people who are in the 48 States. If the Senator can prove that the proposed grant of statehood would be of real benefit to this great organization of 48 States, I am open to argument. I do not accept what the Senator rightly terms an absurdity, namely, the idea of a debt which we owe those people to grant them statehood. There are certain assumptions in that argument that I do not go along with at all. I do not see how the Senator can stop short with only these two Territories, if that is his basis.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon used the term "absurdity" with respect to the absurd argument which was made with regard to extending statehood to the world.

I should like to suggest to the Senator from Arkansas, who very frankly indicates that the one basis on which he would consider any future statehood legislation is that of how much good it would do the present 48 States—and therein the Senator from Oregon differs with the Senator from Arkansas—that, taking that wholly selfish viewpoint, let us bear in mind that we do need to keep both Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands as military outposts; let us bear in mind that the people of those two Territories do have the rights of citizenship and may come and go in our country as they wish, so in that respect we are not opening any doors to them; let us bear in mind that it is worthwhile to have satisfied and patriotic citizens in the two outposts which are so valuable to the security of the United States; let us bear in mind that the United States has long said to the rest of the world that we believe in self-determination and in the right of people to govern themselves; and let us bear in mind that the rest of the world may have its eyes focused on both Alaska and Hawaii, and may well raise the question: "Why do you preach one philosophy while you practice another?"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I can only say that those are very fine moral principles. They are very logical, and they resemble the arguments made by the French. It is very similar to the attitude the French assumed. The fact is that in the experience of the human race, the commonwealth idea as developed in England, with respect to the welfare and happiness of the people in the various areas, has proved the superior effectiveness of that system over the years.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oregon is right when he says that among the important considerations are the happiness and loyalty of the people of Alaska and Hawaii. It is my considered opinion that they will be happier if they have control over their own affairs under a commonwealth status as proposed in the bill I have mentioned. In the long term they will be happier and will be less disappointed than they will be if the Territories are made States and they send to Washington their representa-

tives, who will find out how very little they can do.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am happy to yield once more, but I promised to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to ask a question with respect to a point he has brought out. By yielding at this point continuity of debate might be aided. The Senator seeks to make a comparison between the proposed commonwealth amendment which is now before the Senate and the commonwealth status which now exists in the British community of nations. The Senator, being a great student of British and of other ways of life, is fully aware of the fact, is he not, that British commonwealths have the right to secede from the community of nations at any time they desire to do so? Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that within that so-called commonwealth of nations there is every degree of independence and dependence. It varies all the way from the complete independence and sovereignty of Canada and Australia down to the small dependencies which have none of those freedoms. There are all degrees of dependency in the British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Arkansas has spoken of the proposed commonwealth status for Hawaii and Alaska. That is what I am referring to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We make no secrecy about the proposal. It is like that of Puerto Rico. We would give the people of Hawaii and of Alaska a high degree of self government, in which they would control their own affairs much better than Congress could or has already done.

Mr. CORDON. Of course the Senator realizes that in the British community of nations there is the right of secession; is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; any more than Bermuda has the right of secession. Bermuda has a very high degree of local self-government; but, she does not have the right to secede.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on the same subject?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not arguing on the subject of taxes. It is perfectly all right with me that they should keep their taxes. On the other hand, in many cases I believe we could reach an equitable distribution of some of the burdens. For example, if they wanted funds for the construction of highways, or if they wished to share in some of the appropriations for highway construction and therefore wished to pay Federal gasoline taxes, and so forth, there would be no difficulty about that. The main thing is that they would run their own affairs, and the only reservation would be on their power to conduct foreign relations and with respect to the military.

There is an example in the British commonwealth of nations, Rhodesia, the situation of which approximates almost that which would obtain in the

Territories of Hawaii and Alaska if they were to become commonwealths.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The question has been raised that we owe the people of Hawaii and of Alaska a moral obligation. I am sure that anyone who will take the trouble to examine the debates which took place on the floor of the House and subsequently on the floor of the Senate at the time both Alaska and Hawaii were taken in as Territories, will find that at no time was any representation made that these Territories were to become States. I should like to read a very short quotation as to what the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House had to say on that point at the time the Newlands resolution concerning the annexation of Hawaii was discussed on the floor of the House on June 11, 1898. What I am about to read confirms what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has said on the subject of moral obligation.

I am quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 11, 1898, at pages 5775 to 5776.

Mr. Clardy, a Representative from South Carolina, stated:

The gentleman has very interestingly and very instructively explained various features of this question, but there is one point that I should like to know still further about, and that is this: Suppose these islands are received into the United States under this resolution, what does this administration intend, or what do the people of the United States intend, to do with them? Will they be admitted as a State? It seems to me that is a very important question.

Mr. HITT. I am not a mindreader, and the Almighty alone can answer what is in men's minds.

Mr. CLARDY. The gentleman ought to have some idea of what the Government intends to do.

Mr. HITT. You will have to find that out from other sources. By the terms of this resolution, all such questions will be determined by Congress, and Congress will and should do what the American people want done. The President will have no power over the subject.

I believe that statement clearly demonstrates the fact that no promise was held out to these people, even at the time the Territories came into our possession. The promises arose subsequently in political platforms when the various candidates were trying to get the votes of delegates to the conventions. They said, "If you will be for us, we will advocate statehood for you."

In the final analysis, it is up to Congress to determine what the proper course of action is at this date, in the light of the history of the United States of America as we know it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. There is no moral obligation on this issue anywhere except in the imagination of people who wish to base it upon statements in political platforms. I was trying to point out, in view of the statement by the Senator from Oregon about our owing a moral debt to the people of the Territories, that it is apparently an assumption of such great superiority on the part of this country



that we ought to take in the whole human race into our happy family; we are so good and so great, therefore we should give this great boon to everybody. There is no such obligation at all. The question should be judged primarily upon what effect it would have on this country. So far as happiness is concerned, I am sure the people of the two Territories would be very happy under self-government in a commonwealth status.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas will agree that the political status which would be created by the so-called commonwealth amendment now before the Senate would be substantially the same as the status of an organized Territory, in that there would be reserved the right, under the Constitution of the United States, to change it at its pleasure. Does not the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I would say so. In other words, I made the point that we can, at any time, make Hawaii or Alaska States. Any time we change our minds and think they should be States, we can make them States. However, once that is done, if we make a mistake we cannot change the situation, and they cannot change it. If we make a mistake we and they are stuck with it, whether they like it or not.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator agree that with respect to Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, in the British Commonwealth, any of those countries can at any time secede and establish its own independent government? That represents the difference between the so-called commonwealth status here proposed and that of the British Commonwealths—the difference, in other words, between second-class citizenship and absolutely first-class citizenship, coupled with complete political freedom.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It may be that I do not follow the Senator exactly, but taking Canada as an example, I consider that Canada is just as independent and sovereign a nation as we are. The relationship with Great Britain is largely an emotional one. Canadians have great respect for Great Britain, and many of their institutions are similar. They can and do make decisions on any question, even with reference to going to war. They do not have to go to war.

I do not know what the Senator means by seceding. What I speak of as a commonwealth relationship is that which exists among all those countries which are generally called members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Pakistan has a certain relationship to the Commonwealth, but is as independent for all practical purposes as is the United States. They have accepted a kind of relationship which is not based upon any right to secede or any denial of the right to secede. That does not enter into the question at all. When we speak of Bermuda, Barbados, and so on, we are speaking of possessions which are similar to Guam.

Mr. CORDON. They are not members of the Commonwealth?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are members of the Commonwealth so far as I know.

Mr. CORDON. I am trying to argue about political status.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the word "commonwealth" has any particular meaning of that kind, having only one relationship and no other.

I have before me an official document from the Congressional Library containing the enumeration of all kinds of possessions, such as Canada, Bermuda, and others. We can call it something else if we like. The proposed legislation will speak for itself as to what the relations will be. It grants self-government to the fullest extent with the reservation of our control over defense and foreign relations—

Mr. MAGNUSON. And representation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have their local self-government. They run their own affairs.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is the Senator aware that in this particular amendment the language is such that the people of the Territory of Hawaii or of the Territory of Alaska could be put into the position of voting to accept this particular political status, and then voting to establish a constitution, without having the slightest legal right with respect to any political status which might arise as the result of the action then taken, and that the complete power would still rest in the Congress of the United States to place any type of condition and restriction it might want to place upon both Territories?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have the power to approve their constitutions, which we did in the case of Puerto Rico. We, also, would still have the right, I would say, to pass upon the joint resolution as to their admission as States.

I am not disturbed about the minute provisions. If the Senator wishes to make some change in them and will suggest it, we will give it consideration. The only thing I am saying is that it is not wise as of this time to make States out of these two Territories. They should be given a high degree of self-government. Then let them demonstrate their capacity to govern themselves and their understanding of political procedures, and so forth. The people of Hawaii have a very different background from that of the people of most of the States of the Union.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator consider that the background of the people of the Territory of Hawaii with respect to self-government and with respect to tutelage in self-government, with respect to knowledge of self-government, and of self-administration as of now, has indicated a fairly sizable awareness of their responsibilities as a self-governing State?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have not had the responsibility of electing a Governor, the chief executive. We have been giving that office to persons favored by one party or the other.

Mr. CORDON. They have had to do with electing a legislature, passing laws,

and living under laws, having substantially all the Government establishments of States of the Union.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Interior Department has run both Alaska and Hawaii to a very high degree. Certainly that is true as to Alaska, and to a very considerable extent it is true as to Hawaii. Of course, a governor has considerable influence in Hawaii. He is appointed by the majority party.

I do not follow at all the idea of saying that we owe the Territories statehood today. I think Congress should consider what is best designed to promote the welfare, first, of the United States, and, second, of course, the happiness of the people of Hawaii. We want to be fair to them. I think the recognition of differences is in no way a reflection on them. The idea of second-class citizenship is complete nonsense. I think it is the height of arrogance to assume that the only first-class people in the world are members of these 48 States. There are many people, all over the world, who are first-class citizens.

That argument is a very poor one. I am certain the people of Hawaii are fine people. They comprise the good, the bad, and the indifferent. Merely because they do not have Senators and Representatives does not mean they are inferior or second class. I cannot see how having Senators in Congress would give them a sort of aura or glory or prestige which they would not have under any circumstances. That is not the question at all. The question is whether it is best for them and best for us to violate a tradition which has existed since the United States was formed, by going far beyond our borders and integrating and bringing into the Union a community which is quite different in many respects—not inferior, but different—having different traditions, different ideas, and different cultures, perhaps in many respects even superior ones. They may understand how to live better than we do.

I often think we have gone to seed in our mechanical-gadget civilization. There is great question whether we are as wise as we sometimes think we are, for the longtime survival of our civilization. I hope we have not gone too far. But that is not the question. If once we begin to say we have moral obligations to people in matters of this kind, there will be no stopping. Moral principles are universal. If they are at all moral, they are universal in their application. If we owe the people of these Territories any such duty, I do not know how we can get around the argument that we owe it to the citizens of Guam or any other community of like nature. I think it is dangerous to put the question of statehood on any such basis. It is just as dangerous to put it on a moral basis as it is to put farm price supports on a moral basis, or to condemn price supports because of their alleged immorality or because they may be said to be immoral or to have a bad effect on character.

Those are two points which should not be brought into this kind of argument, because they lead us into very dangerous conclusions all along the road.

We should make up our minds purely upon a limited, restricted basis, namely, the effect upon our welfare, judging it as of now, and that of the people of Hawaii.

I should say that if the statehood bill should be passed by a large majority vote, I might be wrong, but I should dislike to see this kind of decision made by a very close margin, because it is too important, mainly because the decision would be irrevocable.

I feel about this question as I do about amending the Constitution. It is necessary for us to be very careful in this kind of matter. It is not like passing a bill. It is a simple matter to pass a bill which can be repealed next week by a slim margin or with little consideration, if that is what is desired. But when it is proposed to change the Constitution—and the granting of statehood is practically the equivalent of changing the Constitution—it is such a drastic change from the status quo, from a condition in which the country has lived during its history, that I think Congress should go slow. It would be much safer to take the step of granting commonwealth status, and then to give further consideration to statehood.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes. I could not resist speaking after having listened to the answer given by the Senator from Arkansas to what was said by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] about the morality involved in this question. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that I know of no case in which more political morality is involved than in this case.

When areas are incorporated as Territories it is done on the basis that ultimately it is intended to make them States of the Union. That is the first point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may ask him on what basis he makes such a statement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I finish? Then I will yield.

Second, as to the political morality which is involved—and this is where the loosely used term "second-class citizens" comes from—these Territories are comprised of people who have been paying taxes without having representation. I think some political morality is involved in giving them representation, if they are to continue to be taxed. The American people themselves long ago fought the War of the Revolution over taxation without representation. When we consider other areas of the world, such as Guam—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield in a moment.

Guam is a different story altogether. It has no comparison with Hawaii and Alaska, where the people are paying taxes, but have no right to vote for either Representatives in Congress or for President. While Presidential orders can directly affect everyday the lives of the people of Alaska and Hawaii, still they have no right to say anything about whom they shall elect to issue such

orders. I think there is a great deal of political morality involved in the question.

Probably it is true, and I agree with my friends, the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Arkansas, that an argument may be made as to whether the two Territories really are ready for statehood. But as to the political morality and duty we owe to those people, so long as they are taxed and pay money into the coffers of the United States Treasury, and so long as by Executive order their daily lives are controlled by the Federal Government, I think we owe them something.

Senators may disagree as to the time to grant statehood, but, as the Senator from Oregon has stated, and as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, the question is, Will it be good for the United States. Of course it will. What harm can it do the United States? Alaska is a community which, once it becomes a State, will pour money into the coffers of the United States Treasury, and the people of Alaska will run their own government well.

The Senator from Florida quoted Chairman Hitt, I believe, in connection with debate held when the question of the annexation of Hawaii was under consideration as to what could be promised. Chairman Hitt said that only God, the people of the United States, and Congress could decide.

The people of the United States have spoken on this issue. In polls taken on the question of statehood, approximately 80 percent of the people of the United States have been recorded in favor of statehood and real, representative government. Of those who did not speak out and say they were in favor of statehood, I think 12 percent did not know anything about it, and only 6 percent were in opposition to statehood. So the people of the United States, by an overwhelming majority, must believe that statehood for Hawaii and Alaska will be good for the United States.

I cannot see what harm will be done, with one exception. We might as well come right to the point. There are Members of the Senate who believe that diluting 96 by 4 will take away some of their power. They say that commonwealth status will give the Territories everything. It will not give them representation, and still the Territories will be taxed. Executive orders affecting them will still be issued. As the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, they still will be under the hand of Congress, because on any day in any week Congress can change their status.

At every session of Congress pressure exerted will be upon Members of Congress because of something which has happened in Alaska or Hawaii. Many efforts will be made to amend the commonwealth law. The Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New Mexico, I am certain, will agree with that statement. I suppose that half the trouble in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will stem from those who will want to change the commonwealth status.

I think all of us want to legislate in the interest of the people of the United

States. I think all of us can point out and enumerate the great number of benefits which will accrue from statehood. I have yet to have anyone point out to me what harm will be done the United States by granting statehood to these two Territories. The argument will be made by some Senators that granting statehood will dilute the power of United States Senators. It will not dilute their power at the expense of the people of the Territories who still will be taxed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator does not mean to say, does he, that it would not dilute the voting rights and equality of the people of New York, California, Pennsylvania, and other States?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then the Senator would be giving to the people of the Territories not merely representation, but overrepresentation by 33 times.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the Senator's figures, I assume, are correct. But the same was true when Nevada, New Mexico, and my own State of Washington were admitted to the Union; and it is what our Founding Fathers wanted to have.

Mr. MONRONEY. Did our Founding Fathers wish to have us go 2,000 miles overseas and to grant the same equal representation after we had filled the gaps of the land mass?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Founding Fathers established a framework within which States could be admitted after they had been made Territories.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is there anything in the Constitution which indicates that the Founding Fathers had the faintest dream of an overseas empire, which would have equal representation and voting rights with the States of the United States?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not suppose they considered the situation in those terms, but I do not think they dreamed much about the State of Washington or the State of New Mexico. There was a quotation from a statement by Daniel Webster in a famous debate, in which he said he did not think the Union should extend beyond Massachusetts.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not possible that when the good State of Oklahoma was admitted to the Union, there was a dilution of the strength of the other 90 Senators?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course.

Mr. ANDERSON. There was a dilution of the strength of the Senate by the addition of two Senators from Oklahoma. There was a little reduction in the power of all Senators, but no one stopped at that. Later the States of New Mexico and Arizona were admitted to the Union, and their admission diluted the strength of New York, Pennsylvania, and the other States still further. But I have a notion that prior to the granting of statehood no one from either New Mexico, Arizona or Oklahoma ever argued that such dilution would be bad.



Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not familiar with the debates, but I am certain the Senator from New Mexico is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure the Senator would not say that the filling in of the gaps within the land mass by the admission as a State of Washington, Oklahoma, or Nevada, was not an important part of the integration of the Central North American Continent, which constitutes the greatest land mass of contiguous areas having a common interest, and a common tradition and history and possessing the same ideals of freedom. But when it is proposed to leave the contiguous mass and go 2,000 miles overseas, do we not have a right to survey and see if there is not a different question involved than there was in filling the continental gaps?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that there is a different geographical situation, but I think that is a condition which might be far less important than were conditions at the time other States were being admitted. Communications and transportation have made different parts of the whole North American Continent closer today. I venture to say it is easier to get to Alaska and to know what is going on there, or have communication, politically and otherwise, with Alaska, than it was 50 years ago to have communication with the State of Illinois or the State of New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator probably realizes that when California came into the Union in 1850, first approval of the action was not given by the United States Senate, but by a general who was out there. He was the first one who recognized California as a State, because it took too long to get word to and from Washington. Strategically, it was necessary to recognize California as a State. The United States Senate confirmed statehood, but it was a general who first recognized that California had become a State. Today one can fly to Alaska in from 24 to 36 hours.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator has stated we have a moral-political obligation or a political-moral obligation to the Territory of Hawaii and the Territory of Alaska. I wonder if he feels we have a similar obligation to the 2½ million people of Puerto Rico?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course I do not feel that way, and I do not think any of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who have worked on this question for years, feel that such an obligation exists.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thought I understood the Senator to say that any time we took in any territory, we thereby left some implication of a moral-political obligation. We have as possessions the Territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. At one time Newfoundland asked to become a State.

I agree with the Senator that taxation without representation is bad. The people of the Colonies lived under such a system of taxation for a long time before they finally revolted. In this situation we are trying to give the people of the two Territories relief by providing for them a government similar to that which is now enjoyed by Puerto Rico.

Would the Senator agree that Puerto Rico should become a State if the people of that island later decided that they would like to become a State, or as to Guam, if the Guamanians so decided?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a matter for Congress to decide.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator consider that there is a moral obligation to those people?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, not any more, because we have discharged that obligation.

Mr. SMATHERS. If we give to the Territory of Hawaii the same status we have given to Puerto Rico, then I conclude that the Senator arrives at the same conclusion, that we have discharged our political and moral obligation. Am I not correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; the manner in which we acquired the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska and the way we acquired Puerto Rico were entirely different.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I still maintain we have to pay attention to the words "incorporated" and "unincorporated" Territory. I know the terms have been treated as if they were synonymous, but the situation is completely different. Once a Territory is incorporated, it is in anticipation of statehood. It has been so held. The Supreme Court has passed on the insular cases time after time, and has shown that Puerto Rico obtained a wholly different status from that of Alaska and Hawaii, and that such an obligation does not exist with regard to Puerto Rico.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Puerto Rico is not incorporated.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. That has been said all along, and yet on May 27, 1901, the first time the question of incorporation arose, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *De Lima v. Bidwell* (182 U. S.), stated as follows, at pages 195 and 196:

One of the ordinary incidents of a treaty is the cession of territory. It is not too much to say it is the rule, rather than the exception, that a treaty of peace, following upon a war, provides for a cession of territory to the victorious party. It was said by Chief Justice Marshall in *American Ins. Co. v. Canter* (1 Pet. 511, 542): "The Constitution confers absolutely upon the Government of the Union the powers of making war and of making treaties; consequently that Government possesses the power of acquiring territory, either by conquest or by treaty."

The following is the part of the opinion I should like to emphasize:

The territory thus acquired—

The Court is talking about Puerto Rico—

is acquired as absolutely as if the annexation were made, as in the case of Texas and Hawaii, by an act of Congress.

The terms "incorporated" and "unincorporated" were dreamed up in the Insular cases, because there were some rich people in Hawaii we wanted to tax, although the people of Hawaii were poor, generally speaking. So we had to think of some legal legerdemain in order to justify taxing them, and the words "incorporated" and "unincorporated" were concocted. Those words had never been mentioned before. In the Organic Act of March 30, 1822, applicable to my State of Florida, no mention was made as to whether it was incorporated or unincorporated territory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If it was not mentioned up to then, it was mentioned at that time, and it is now in effect.

Mr. SMATHERS. But the opinion infers that Puerto Rico is in the same category with Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. The very treaty by which we acquired territory which subsequently came into the Union prior to the treaty of 1898 said the territory was brought into the United States and that the people living in the States carved out of it had the same rights as citizens of the United States. That language is repeated without exception as to all the Territories.

When the Treaty of Paris was drawn in 1898, there was a vast difference of opinion. There was no such recital clause in that treaty. The explanation was given then, though I do not say it is a good one, that it was thought the Spanish law was different from the law of the United States, and that it was not proper to bring the new possessions in on the same basis with our States and offer their residents the same rights as citizens. This is not something that was dreamed up; it is something which took place and was recognized by the State Department in drafting the Treaty of Paris. The language is in the treaty, and anyone who desires to do so can read it.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure that the Senator from New Mexico, who is an able lawyer, as I have said before, in his examination of the treatment accorded to Puerto Rico and that accorded to the Territory of Hawaii, with the exception of tax relief, will agree that there was no right which the people of the Territory of Hawaii had which the people of Puerto Rico did not have.

When it is stated that the words "organized territory" were not mentioned in the Treaty of Paris of 1898, I agree. As a matter of fact, it was not mentioned, when the Territory of Hawaii was taken in, that at that very time it was an organized Territory. That expression came up later. It was a matter of convenience. As the Senator from Arkansas has said, these are technical matters. The people who walk the streets of San Juan will not understand

when one says, "You cannot come in as a State because you are not incorporated." When the people of Guam or Ketchikan in Alaska are told that they cannot be admitted as a State because they are not incorporated, I am sure they will not understand or care about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I still reiterate that there is a great deal of difference, both legal and otherwise, in our political-moral obligation as it affects the people of Alaska and Hawaii and as it affects the people of Puerto Rico.

I hope the Senators from Arkansas, Florida, and Oklahoma, will do something about the word "commonwealth." I hope our British background will not get the best of us, because I am sure there are many sturdy people up in Alaska who would somewhat resent being referred to as commonwealth citizens and not citizens of the United States. If they should vote on the question, I think the ridicule of the word "commonwealth" would defeat it before the election could get started.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure the Senator will agree that the great States of Virginia and Massachusetts are Commonwealths, and that the Senator would not want to leave the impression that there is anything wrong with those great States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would not want to leave the impression that there is anything wrong with either State, but, as a practical matter, that is one thing which the people of Alaska would not understand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean they would resent it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would resent the word.

## RECESS

Mr. CARLSON. If there is no other Senator who wishes to be heard, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, March 30, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 29 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Francis L. Van Dusen, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Guy K. Bard, resigned.

John L. Miller, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice William A. Stewart, deceased.

John W. Lord, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice James P. McGranery, resigned.

### IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ron K. Cox  
William H. Pitt, Jr.

The following-named (A. R. O. T. C.) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Richard D. Buttolph  
James J. Byrd  
Walter S. Crumbley  
Robert J. Cuozzo  
Edgar W. Davenport  
Donald D. Durham

Kenneth E. Wolff (Naval Reserve aviator) to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers (naval aviators) to the grades indicated in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

### CAPTAIN

Stanley E. Adams	Milton E. Law
James F. Allen	Gerald R. Lentz
Robert E. Ball	Robert Lewis, Jr.
William J. Barbanes	William R. Locke
Paul A. Bernas	Robert E. Luther
Robert E. Blount	Duane G. Lynch
Edward E. Brown	John H. Maloney
Richard K. Brown	Herbert F. McCormick
George H. Cullins	Hugh McCoy
Donald C. Donaldson	Robert E. Nelson
James M. Feehery	Emery A. Neuschwander
John Fischer	William E. Otte
Lynwood V. Fletcher	Robert E. Paulson
Steve Furimsky, Jr.	Robert V. Reese
Leland S. Gaug	John T. Ryan
Frederick B. Haines	William M. Sample
Richard B. Haines	William M. H. Schrantz
William D. Harris	Stephen L. Schuster, Jr.
William B. Higgins	Robert C. Simons
William H. Johnson	Kenneth J. Smock
Harvey A. Keeling, Jr.	Harold D. Snell
William D. Kelly	William E. Weber
John W. Kirkland	
Harold R. Knowles	
James G. A. Knox	

### FIRST LIEUTENANT

Robert L. Allen	Samuel Levine
Wolcott D. Baird	Carl R. Lundquist
William W. Breaux	William L. Moore
Lawrence E. Cheatum	Gerald D. Overmyer
James W. Dillon	George Pechar
Roland W. Golz	Eugene F. Poole
Marsh A. Graham	Clarke E. Rhykerd
Harold Z. Gray	Frank R. Smoke
William L. Green	Walter C. Sprowls
Kenneth J. Hice	John S. Thompson
Walter C. Kelly	

### SECOND LIEUTENANT

William R. Beeler	Laverne D. Highhouse
Ernest C. Brace	Charles E. Kiser
William Q. Brothers, Jr.	Leo J. LeBlanc, Jr.
Horace A. Bruce	Frank L. Leister
William E. Caslin	Edison W. Miller
Jimmie L. Dillon	Arthur S. Ohlgren
Raymond L. Duvall, Jr.	Darold D. Parrish
Charles R. Gray	Edward J. Sample
John Havlik	Laurence A. Taylor
Lawrence R. Hawkins	James S. Thompson
Richard L. Hawley	Ronald Trepas
	Ted Uhlemeyer, Jr.
	Bobby R. Wilkinson

The following-named officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert G. Abbott	Robert G. Bickert
Donald T. Alchroth	Richard R. Blair
Richard A. Alm	Walter E. Blayton
James V. Andersen	Harry J. Bottorff
William B. Anderson, Jr.	Joe E. Bradberry
John B. Arquette	Francis X. Brandon
John H. Austin	Bernard B. Brause, Jr.
Robert H. Axton	Richard P. Bray
Edward E. Backus	Richard S. Broderick
Frank N. Bales	Guy L. Brown
William L. Bearchell	Joseph P. Brower
Joseph Begines	Charles D. Bujan
Homer L. Bennett	Thomas "K" Burk, Jr.
William D. Benton	Cortlandt O. Bymaster
Harland W. Berndt	William J. Callery, Jr.
	John W. Campbell

Louis J. Cavallo  
Guy R. Chaney  
John W. Chester, Jr.  
Robert S. Chockley  
Leland L. Coggan, Jr.  
James F. Coleman  
John C. Conlin  
Richard F. Connell  
Thomas L. Costello  
Donald L. Cox, Jr.  
Warren G. Cretney  
Frederick J. Cripe  
James R. Crutchfield  
Sigmund J. Cysewski, Jr.

Arthur J. Daglis  
John H. Decker  
John Denora  
Jack L. Dewell  
Warren M. Dodson, Jr.  
Peter E. Donnelly, Jr.  
John E. Dowsett  
Donald J. Duckworth  
Joseph N. Eggleston  
David L. Elam  
Nathaniel R. Elliott, Jr.  
Charles B. Erickson  
Ronald E. Fauver  
George B. Ferrington  
Malcolm V. Fites  
Daniel J. Ford  
Ralph Fortie  
David L. Foster  
Roger D. Foster  
Robert F. Franks, Jr.  
James W. Friberg  
Robert L. Fry  
Edward W. Gallagher  
Robert G. George  
Sam M. Gipson, Jr.  
John W. Gore, Jr.  
Malcolm G. Gregory  
Ronald L. Hamby  
Donnie N. Harman  
Curtis E. Hays  
Henry S. Heffley, Jr.  
Richard W. Herbst  
David G. Herron  
Donald R. Himmer  
Ralph P. Holt  
Earl R. Hunter  
Harold L. Jackson, Jr.  
Lawrence B. Jackson  
Clifford H. Johnson  
Mannon A. Johnson, Jr.

Robert C. Jones  
Danna Joyce  
William K. Joyner  
Charles C. Keightley  
Herbert S. Keimling, Jr.  
William M. Kendrick  
Paul T. Kennedy  
Francis R. Kiernan  
Robert D. Klein  
Leroy E. Koleber  
Howard M. Koppenhaver  
Edward S. Krass  
Jene R. Kutchmarek  
James T. Larkin  
Rodney O. Lawrence  
Donald Q. Layne  
Maurice G. J. Legrand  
Richard J. Lewis  
Walter R. Limbach  
Orville V. Lippold, Jr.  
Edwin W. Lockard  
Lamar K. Looney, Jr.  
Joseph J. Louder  
William T. Lunsford  
Joseph W. Martinelli

Aloysius A. Androlewicz, Jr. (civilian college graduate), to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy,

John R. Matheson  
Warren M. McConnell  
John F. McGee  
William N. McGuane  
James J. McMonagle  
Earl C. Meek  
George W. Meyer  
Michael C. Mikulics  
Edmund H. Miller  
Johnes K. Moore  
James L. Murphy  
Christian A. Nast, Jr.  
Buel B. Newman, Jr.  
Bernard J. Newton  
William J. Nielsen  
Thomas F. E. Nugent  
Robert A. Olsen  
John T. O'Shea  
Paul L. Oshirak  
Robert P. Palmer  
James P. Parrish  
Norman B. Patberg, Jr.  
Richard A. Paynter  
Stephen Percy  
Jimmie R. Phillips  
Rex L. Pickett, Jr.  
Karl B. Pieper  
John E. Poindexter  
Jack G. Pollard  
Frank T. Rice  
John M. Roe, Jr.  
John A. Rosengrant  
Cledwyn P. Rowlands  
Carroll E. Salls  
Martin E. Salter, Jr.  
Earle L. Sanborn, Jr.  
Laveen D. Schmidt  
George R. Schremp, Jr.  
Lawrence A. Schulte, Jr.

Raymond A. Shaffer  
John E. Sinclair  
Richard E. Sloan  
Buck D. Smith  
Craig S. Smith  
Frederick A. Smith  
Haywood R. Smith  
James M. Smith  
Melvin A. Soper, Jr.  
John A. Sparks  
David A. Spurlock  
Arnold W. Stanley  
Ernest L. Staples, Jr.  
Cullen G. Starnes, Jr.  
Fred W. St. Clair  
Louis J. Steck  
Ray A. Stephens  
Ray B. Utice  
Donald H. Strain  
Edward B. Subowsty  
William M. Sullivan  
James T. Swinney  
Charles H. Taylor, Jr.  
Charles E. Teague  
David E. Thomas  
Robert H. Thompson  
Bobby C. Turner  
William C. Vanin-wegen  
Daniel J. Viera  
James W. Walker  
John B. Walker, Jr.  
Homer L. Welch  
Joseph J. Went  
Robert P. Whalen  
Richard J. Wheelock  
Jean P. White  
Frank P. Williams, Jr.  
Robert L. Wilson, Jr.  
Billie W. Windsor  
Donald E. Wood  
Harvey Wright



subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

**LIEUTENANT**

James P. Semmens

**LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)**

Richard H. Tabor

Thomas W. Turner

Frank J. Pellizzari to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Henry D. Baldridge, Jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Betty E. Rigby to be a lieutenant in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Everett E. Emrick to be a temporary chief radio electrician in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father James Chandler Donohue, St. Edward's Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of us all, we humbly ask You to bless the Congress of the United States of America. Guard and guide its Members and grant them three graces.

First, the grace to know truth and uphold it, no matter how perilous such a task appears in a world where whole nations build idols to falsehood.

Secondly, grant them the grace of perseverance when obstacles make the job of guiding our country discouraging.

And finally, give them the grace of love. Love of God and love of neighbor. For without that twofold charity upon which our Nation was founded, they would work in vain.

This we ask for them in the name of Thy only Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who died and suffered for us that we might live.

May the blessing of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit descend upon you and remain forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 25, 1954, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8224. An act to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. GEORGE, and

Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5337) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6025) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. KEFAUVER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 54-10.

### REDUCING EXCISE TAXES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. REED of New York, JENKINS, SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, COOPER, and MILLS.

### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 8224

Mr. REED of New York. I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider any conference report on the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes and for other purposes, the same day reported to the House notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on H. R. 8224 have until midnight tonight to file their report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

### COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 468 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause 8 of rule XI of the Rules of the House and House Resolution 150, 83d Congress, as amended by House Resolution 339, 83d Congress, incurred by (1) the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, not to exceed \$51,000 additional, (2) the Public Accounts Subcommittee of such committee, not to exceed \$52,000 additional, and (3) the International Operations Subcommittee of such committee, not to exceed \$52,000 additional, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the subcommittee which incurred the expenses, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "additional", insert the following: "for investigations in the Department of Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, Interior, Post Office, and Treasury."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a privileged resolution, and under the rules it will be considered as a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. It is a privileged resolution.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution came from the Committee on House Administration, with a committee amendment, which was adopted by unanimous vote of the committee, and has been adopted by the House. The resolution provides for funds for investigations by three subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations. Subcommittees of Government Operations have practically become autonomous committees by the terms of a resolution adopted last July in the House, setting up permanent subcommittees in the Committee on Government Operations and giving those committees almost the authority and jurisdiction of a regular standing committee of the House. The chairmen of the three subcommittees, the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Ohio, and the gentleman from Indiana presented budgets and convinced the committee that the plans for investigations are justified, so that the amount of money is not excessive. These investigations were launched last